95-4
7

LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N.J.

Case, ... Division ..... I .....
Shelf, ... Section ..... 7 .....
Book, ... No. .....

SCC #10,961 v.19

The Chinese repository

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/chinesereposito1911unse_0

THE

CHINESE REPOSITORY.

VOL. XIX.

FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1850.

CANTON:
PRINTED FOR THE PROPRIETORS.
.....
1850.

INDEX.

Accession, Hienfung's edict of.. 286
Affray near Nanking..... 229
Aloah, arguments for using..... 96
Aloho for God, objections to.... 616
Amaral's death, papers on..... 50
Amour river, notice of the..... 289
Amoy, trade at in 1849..... 521
Asylum for outcasts..... 228,391

Bambooing, case of..... 308
Barrow's passage of Yellow R.. 507
Bethel at Whampoa..... 168
Bettelheim, letter from..... 17,57
Bible, committee on revising the. 464
Bible, version of the Chinese... 544
Bird's Consular Regulations, &c. 54
Bonham goes to Shánghái..... 344
Bonham returns to Hongkong... 403
Bonham's communication respecting pirates..... 163
Boone's Defense of his Essay on Shin...345, 409, 465, 569,625
Bowring's ode for Seamen's bethel 168
Bowring's thoughts, strictures on 191
Bowring's Ode to the Deity..... 245
Bridgman, death of Rev. J. G... 680
British and foreign trade for 1849 513
Budhists in Siam..... 548
Budhists in Tibet, tenets of.... 668

Calendar for the year 1850..... 2
Calvin's views of God..... 635
Camboja, trade with..... 565
Canton in 1849, trade at..... 513
Canton, high officers at..... 14
Canton, epidemic in 288,343
Capital punishment, mode of.... 56
Characters, different sorts of.... 180
China, early works on..... 652
Chinese in California..... 510
Chinese notions of creation 361,369
Chinese coolies going to Peru.. 344
Chinese language, changes in.. 179
Chinese know the true God..... 188
Chinese trade with Japan..... 214
Chinese reckless of life..... 308
Chingtú, city of..... 324
Christianity, edict respecting... 566
Chú fútsz's cosmogony..... 373
Churches at Shánghái..... 109
Cities in China very dirty..... 367
Climate of Sz'chuen..... 318
Coal in China..... 388,395
Cockrane at Lewchew, admiral,... 23
Coffins left unburied..... 391
Co-hong, attempt to re-establish. 406
Consular returns of trade..... 513
Consuls in China foreign,..... 15
Confession of Amaral's murderers 53
Consular regulations at Whampoa 54
Coolies taken to Peru..... 344
Corea, Japanese troops attack... 214

Da Cunha's death..... 404
Da Cunha, governor of Macao.. 344
Davis, John W. leaves China... 281
Donation returned in Shánghái. 391
Doors, gods who protect..... 314

Edict on eclipse of Feb. 12th... 165
Eloah can be transferred..... 356
Elohim, how to be translated... 90
Elohim, how properly translated 185
Elohim and Theos, proper rendering of..... 345
Emperor, policy of new..... 394
Emperor's death..... 165
Emperor's new proclamation... 231
Empress-dowager canonized.... 344
Empress dowager, death of..... 111
Empress-dowager, mourning for 281
Epidemic in Canton..... 288,343
Eras in use in Eastern Asia.... 1
Etymologicon, notice of the.... 169
Executions at Canton..... 55
Exhibition, meeting in favor of.. 404

Famine diminishing..... 390
Famines in Shanghái 107,113
Famines in Sz'chuen..... 402
Fast, death of Rev. C..... 623
Fire pits, account of..... 399
Fire, notice of the God of..... 315
Foreigners in China, list of.... 3
Forcade at Lewchew..... 21
Fuhchau, foreigners not to live in 459
Fung, how to be translated..... 487
Furnace, god of the..... 316

Geography by Sü, notice of 600,648
Geography, notices of a..... 457
God, character of the word..... 630
God, how to be rendered..... 90
Gods, notice of several..... 312
God, two words may be used for 280
God, thoughts on term for..... 185
God not a generic term..... 409
God not a correlative of creature 524
God defined, the word..... 572
God of wealth, notice of the.... 589

Hales' origin of idolatry..... 423
Háikwoh Tú Chí, notice of. 135,206
Háinan, cholera in..... 680
Heaven and Earth, altars to..... 148
Hienfung's auspicious proclamation..... 231
H'lassa, its environs..... 666
H'lari, incident of Huc in..... 670
Hobson's hospital in Canton.... 300
Hongkong, list of officers in.... 11
Honorary portals in Canton..... 568
Hospitals at Canton and Shánghái 300
Howqua's petition for the co-hong 406
Huc's travels in Tibet..... 650
Húnán, topography of..... 156
Húpeh, topography of..... 97

Idolatry in Lewchew..... 59
Idolatry not always polytheism.. 192
Imbert's account of salt-pits.... 325
Imperial family, promotions in.. 232
Insurgents in Kwángsí..... 462,511
Insurgents in Kwángtung.. 568,619
Insanity among the Chinese... 330

Japan noticed in Háikwoh Chí.135,206
Japanese incursions into China.. 106
Japanese in Formosa..... 206
Jehovah, how to be transferred.. 97
Jesus, trampling on image of.... 216
Jesuits, apology for the..... 118
Julien's translation upon types.. 250

Kampot, a port in Camboja..... 565
Kánsuh, rivers in..... 502
Kánsuh, topography of..... 554
Kánsuh, traveling in..... 662
Kiáying chau, edict from..... 566
Kíying's official life and ranks.. 166
Koko-nor, notices of..... 499,663
Kwángsi, insurgents in..... 462
Kwángtung, banditti in..... 512

Legge's Argument, notice of.. 358
Legge's Letters reviewed..... 632
Lewchew visited by the Reynard 623
Lewchew not a Chinese dependency 17
Lightning, spirit of the..... 312
Lin Tsehsü, death of..... 624
Lin appointed commissioner.... 568
Lockhart's hospital report..... 300
Looker-on's letter on word for God 280
Looker-on's reply to Dr. Legge 524
Lowrie's Memoir, notice of..... 491

Macao, list of officers in..... 13
Macao, papers from Council of... 50
Macao. death of governor of.... 404
Macgowan's notice of sand.... 328
Macgowan's notices of coal.... 385
Manchúria, rivers in..... 289
Manchús, holy wars of the..... 241
Manifesto of insurgents..... 568
Mariner at Lewchew, H. M. S.... 67
Mariner's visit to Japan..... 509
Marco Polo's account of Sand-T.. 564
Meadows on Mongolian letters. 526
Medhurst's letter to Missionaries 95
Medhurst's Reply, notice of.... 353
Medhurst's Letter on shin..... 445
Medhurst has many views... .. 459
Medhurst's Inquiry on Ruach... 478
Medhurst's strictures on Philo.. 486
Medical Miss. Soc. 15th Report 253
Medical practice at Napa..... 82
Men and things in Shánghái... 105
Metallic types in Chinese..... 247
Ming dynasty, Japanese come in 136
Missions in Shánghái..... 330
Missionaries, movements of..... 232
Missionaries, arrival of..... 408
Missions in Lewchew..... 17,57
Mohammedan pagoda in Canton 542
Monument, corrections in Syrian 552
Mongolian letters to France.... 526
Mongolia, travels in..... 651
Morality of the Chinese..... 233
Morrison on state religion..... 380

Morrison's version of Bible..... 341
Morrison E. Society, meeting. . 675
Mourning for Empress-dowa. 111,281
Mung-kí-peh-tán, extract from.. 251

Nánhái hien's edict against rumors 288
Napa, landing effected at..... 18
Neptune of the Chinese..... 313
Nestorian temples in China..... 648
Newyear, edict to change day of 165
New Testament revised..... 340
Newton's remarks on word God 430
Ningpo, bridge of boats at..... 464
Ningpo in 1849, trade at..... 523
North-China Herald, a new paper 462
Nourishing the Spirit, tract on.. 450

Ode to the Deity, Russian..... 245
Office, instance of purchase of.. 677
Ophthalmic Hospital, Report of... 253
Opium, poisoning by..... 304
Opium increasingly used..... 108

Pagodas about Canton..... 535
Palmerston's letter to Peking... 393
Parker's report of Hospital..... 253
Paul Sü's Apology for the Jesuits 118
Pawnbrokers robbed at Kiáting. 231
Peking Gazettes not reliable... 229
Peking, altars to Heaven & earth 148
Philo's Diversions, notice of.... 486
Pirates, plans for pursuing..... 231
Pirates dispersed by the Medea. 163
Poor relieved in times of famine. 114
Poor relieved in Shánghái..... 227
Portuguese frigate blown up... 680
Postmasters in China..... 230
Postal arrangements in China... 282
Preble, U. S. sloop at Napa.... 68

Residents in China, foreign,.... 3
Reynard's visit to the Pei ho... 403
Reynard, decree respecting the. 678
Reynvaan, attack on H. G. I.... 112
Rivers in Sz'chuen..... 319
Romish missions in Mongolia... 651
Ruach, how to be translated ... 478

Sagalien river and island, notice of 289
Sailing directions for Shánghai.. 621
Salt-pits in Sz'chuen..... 325
Second-bar pagoda 537
Shanghái, men and things in 105,390
Shánghái in 1849, trade at..... 518
Shanghái, beggars in..... 227
Shanghái, various famines at... 113
Shanghái, sailing directions to.. 621
Shánghái, population of..... 105
Shanghái, missions at..... 330
Shánghái, report of hospital at.. 300
Shánghái, good position of..... 463
Shangti used as a proper name.. 472
Shángti can not be God propriè. 367
Shángti, derivation of name.... 187
Shángti, reasons for rejecting.. 626
Shangti is the true God..... 359
Shedden at Lewchew..... 76
Shensí, topography of..... 220
Shin and ti, how they differ.... 92
Shin, reasons for not using..... 95
Shin, their position..... .. 199
Shin used generically for god.. 457
Shin has many meanings..... 481
Shin used for god by Chinese... 595
Shin, errors in views of..... 627
Showers of sand in China..... 328
Shwoh Wan Kiái-tsz', notice of. 169
Siamese laws respecting Budhists 548
Si-ngán, a city in Shensí..... 224
Silkworms, patron of..... 314
Sing Shí Páu Yen, a tract..... 233
Small pox common in China.... 392
Smith, arrival of Bishop..... 232
Southwell, notice of late Mr.... 333
Spirit, how to be rendered..... 478
Spalding, notice of late Mr..... 334
Staunton's remarks on God.... 349
St. Mary's sloop of war..... 55
Sü's memorial respecting bandits 619
Sü's honorary portals..... 568
Sü's answer respecting pirates.. 146
Sü's dispatches respecting Amaral's murderers..... 51
Syrian monument, errors in.... 552
Sz'chuen, topography of..... 317
Sz'chuen, towns in..... 394,672

Tarakai, island of..... 296
Táukwáng, his family..... 284
Táukwáng, demise of..... 165
Táukwang, will of..... 676
Taverns of the Mongols..... 653
Tchakars of Chihlí..... 657
Tea cultivated in United States 511
Temples at Lewchew..... 31
Temples in China, Christian... 648
Testament, resolution respecting 545
Ti, its adaptation to render Theos 201
Tien and ti worshiped by Chinese 436
Theos, how used in Homer.... 196
Tibet, Huc's travels in..... 665

Tolon-nor, a city in Chihli..... 654
Trade with China for 1849..... 531
Tract on morality, native..... 233
Trinity church falls down..... 464
Tsing Shing Wú Kú noticed.... 241
Tsz'ki, accident at..... 464
Types made by a Chinese..... 248

U. S. sloop of war St. Mary's..... 55

Varnish tree in Sz'chuen..... 396
Version of Old Testament..... 110
Victoria made a city and a see... 56

Wall of China, notice of..... 677
Waterland on notion of God.... 644
War, strategy of Japanese in... 151
Wei Yuen, author of Holy Wars 244
Welton at Fuhchau, Rev. W... 459
Whampoa, Seamen's bethel at.. 168
Whampoa consular regulations... 54
Whilden, death of Mrs. E. J.... 112
Will of Táukwáng..... 284
Wúchàng, a large city in Húpeh 101
Wylie, notice of late Mrs..... 332

Yángtsz' kiáng, inundation of.. 104
Yellow river, course of..... 491
Yih King, cosmogony of the.... 362

CONTENTS.

No. 1.

Art. I. The comparative English and Chinese Calendar for 1850; names of the foreign residents at the Five Ports and Hongkong; list of officers in the governments of Hongkong, Macao, and Canton; foreign legations and consular establishments in China..... 1

Art. II. Letter from Rev. B. J. Bettelheim, M. D., giving an account of his residence and missionary labors in Lewchew during the last three years..... 17

Art. III. Journal of Occurrences: affairs at Macao; notice from the British consular agent at Whampos; U. S. sloop of war St. Mary's; executions among the Chinese; town of Victoria made a city, and the colony of Hongkong erected into a bishop's see..... 50

No. 2.

Art. I. Letter from Rev. B. J. Bettelheim, M. D., giving an account of his residence and missionary labors in Lewchew during the last three years. *(Continued from page 49)*..... 57

Art. II. Letter to the Editor of the Chinese Repository respecting the objects to be had in view in translating Elohim and Theos..... 90

Art. III. Topography of the province of Húpeh; list of its departments and districts; description of its principal towns, notice of its rivers, lakes, productions. 97

Art. IV. Men and things in Shánghai: number and character of its population; tything system; taxation; sickness and pauperism; distribution of food; use of opium and prospect of the traffic being legalized: increase of the general commerce; the number of foreign residents; new churches dedicated; converts to Christianity; Committee of Delegates for revision of the Old and New Testaments in Chinese. *From a Correspondent*..... 105

Art. V. Journal of Occurrences: death of the Empress-dowager; decease of Mrs. Whilden at Canton; attack on Mr. Reynvaan..... 110

No. 3.

Art. I. Notice of the years of famine and distress which have occurred at Shánghái, recorded in the Statistics of Shánghái..... 311

Art. II. Paul Sü's Apology, addressed to the emperor Wánlih of the Ming dynasty, in behalf of the Jesuit missionaries, Pantoya and others, who had been impeached by the Board of Rites in a Report dated the 44th year, 7th month of his reign, (A. D. 1617..... 113

Art. III. Japan: A translation of the 12th chapter of the Hái-kwoh Tú Chi, 海國圖志 or Notices of Foreign Countries, illustrated with Maps and Engravings. Published at the city of Yangchau fu in Kiángsú, in the summer of 1847 135

Art. IV. Topography of the province of Húnán; its area, population, lakes, rivers, mountains, productions, &c., with a list of its departments and districts..... 156
Art. V. Journal of Occurrences: attack on pirates in Mir's bay, and correspondence relating to it; edict in reference to a change in newyear's day; death of the emperor of China; position of Kiying; dedication of Seamen's Bethel at Whampoa 162

No. 4.

Art. I. Shwoh Wan Kiái-tsz', Sū shi Hi-chuen, Sz'-shih kiuen; 說文解字 徐氏繫傳四十卷 or The Etymologicon [of Hü Shin] with a Supplementary Commentary by Sū, in forty sections. By PHILO..... 169
Art. II. Thoughts on the term proper to be employed in translating Elohim and Theos into Chinese. By a Missionary. In a Letter to the Editor..... 185
Art. III. Japan: A translation of the 12th chapter of the Hái-kwoh Tú Chí, 海國圖志 or Notices of Foreign Countries, illustrated with Maps and Engravings. Published at the city of Yángchau fū in Kiángsú, in the summer of 1847.—*(Continued from page* 156.)..... 206
Art. IV. Topography of Shensi; its boundaries, area, rivers, divisions, cities, population, productions, &c..... 220
Art. V. Men and Things in Shánghái; famine; violent begging; contributions solicited; distribution of food; asylum for outcast children; oppression and assault; postmaster generals; pawnbrokers robbed; pirate-catchers. Letter to the Editor from SPECTATOR..... 227
Art. VI. Journal of Occurrences: Edict of accession of H. M. Hienfung; honors given his brothers; religious intelligence, arrival of the Bishop of Victoria.... 231

No. 5.

Art. I. Sing Shí Páu Yen 醒世寶言 Precious Words to Awaken the Age. By CHANG LICHEN. Published at Canton, 1848..... 233
Art. II. The Holy Wars: Tá-tsing Shing Wū Kí, or Records of the Military Achievements of the Monarchs of the Great Pure Dynasty. Compiled by WEI YUEN of Sháuyáng in Húnán province. 20 vols. 8vo. 3d edition, revised and enlarged. 1846..... 241
Art. III. Ode to the Deity. From the Russian..... 245
Art. IV. Movable Metallic Types among the Chinese..... 247
Art. V. Fifteenth Report of the Medical Missionary Society's Ophthalmic Hospital at Canton, for the years 1848 and 1549. By Rev. P. PARKER, M.D..... 253
Art. VI. Letter regarding the word used for God in Chinese. By A LOOKER-ON. 280
Art. VII. Journal of Occurrences: departure of H. E. John W. Davis; ceremonies observed at Canton by the authorities upon the empress' death, last edict of Táukwáng; bounties conferred by the new emperor; notices of his family; epidemic at Canton..... 281

No. 6.

Art. I. Notices of the Sagalien river, and the island of Tarakai opposite its mouth. 289
Art. II. Medical Missions: 1. General Report of the Hospital at Kam-li-fau in Canton, from April 1848, to Nov, 1849. By B. HOBSON, M. B. pp. 57.
2. Report of the Committee of the Chinese Hospital, Shánghái, from January 1st to December 31st, 1849. pp. 18..... 300
Art. III. Mythological account of some Chinese deities, chiefly those connected with the elements. *Translated from the Sü Shin Ki*..... 312
Art. IV. Topography of the province of Sz'chuen; its area, rivers, lakes, mountains, divisions, towns, productions, and inhabitants..... 317
Art. V. Remarks on showers of sand in the Chinese Plain. By D. J. MACGOWAN, 328
Art. VI. What I have seen in Shánghái: Protestant missionr; the late Mrs. Wylie. Mr. Southwell, and Mr. Spalding; notices of each mission; distribution of alms; chaplaincy in Trinity church; Bethel flag; Chinese version of the N. Testament; article on Elohim and Theos.—*Letter to the Editor by E. C. B*.. 330
Art. VII. Journal of Occurrences: epidemic at Canton; H. E. governor Sū; arrival of the governor of Macao; canonization of the late Empress-dowager; Gov. Bonham's visit to Shánghái; emigration of Chinese to America..... 343

No. 7.

Art. I. Defense of an Essay on the proper rendering of the words Elohim and Theos into the Chinese Language. By W. J. BOONE..... 345
Art. II. Notices of Coal in China. By D. J. MACGOWAN, M. D., Cor, Mem. of the Asiatic Society of Bangal..... 365
Art. III. Men and things in Shanghai: scene changed; the spring propitious, early

harvests plentiful; famine and beggary diminished; a forced donation returned; the asylum for outcast children dismantled; unburied coffins; small pox; fever; moat and ditches excavated; smuggling; the opium question; Lord Palmerston's letter. *Letter to the Editor from Spectator*..... 390
Art. IV. Topography of the province of Sz'chuen: description of its towns, productions, inhabitants, &c. *(Continued from page 327)*..... 394
Art. V. Journal of Occurrences: return of the Str. Reynard and Gov. Bonham; death of Gov. Da Cunha; meeting in relation to the Exhibition of Industry in 1851; licensing of tea-brokers at Canton; movements of Missionaries..... 403

No. 8.

Art. I. Defense of an Essay on the proper rendering of the words Elohim and Theos into the Chinese Language. By W. J. Boone..... 409
Art. II. Letter to the Editor of the Repository, accompanied with a translation of a Chinese tract upon Nourishing the Spirit. By W. H. Medhurst D. D... 445
Art. III. Journal of Occurrences: endeavor to prevent foreigners from living in Fuhchau; disturbances in Kwangsi; North-China Herald; facilities of the port of Shánghái; fall of Trinity church; accident at Tsz'ki; bridge of Boats at Ningpo; completion of the revision of the New Testament..... 459

No. 9.

Art. I. Defense of an Essay on the proper rendering of the words Elohim and Theos into the Chinese language. By W. J. Boone. *(Continued from page 444.)* 465
Art. II. An Inquiry into the proper mode of translating Ruach and Pneuma, in the Chinese version of the Scriptures. By W. H. Medhurst, Sen. Shanghai, Printed at the Mission Press, 1850..... 478
Art. III. Animadversions on the Philological Diversions of Philo, by W. H. Medhurst, Sen., in his Inquiry into the proper mode of translating Ruach and Pneuma, examined in a Note by Philo. *Communicated for the Repository*..... 486
Art. IV. Memoir of Rev. Walter M. Lowrie, Missionary to China..... 491
Art. V. Course and topography of the Hwáng ho or Yellow river..... 499
Art. VI. Journal of Occurrences; H. M. S. Mariner's visit to Japan; cultivation of tea in the United States; emigration of Chinese to America; memorial respecting disturbances in Kwángsi; insurgents in Kwángtung..... 509

No. 10.

Art. I. Consular Returns of the British and Foreign trade with China for 1849 513
Art. II. Letter to the Editor of the Repository upon Dr. Legge's Argument on the word for God in Chinese. By A Looker-on..... 524
Art. III. Translations and Notice of two Mongolian Letters to Philip the Fair, King of France, 1305. By Mr. Meadows, Consular Interpreter, Canton.... 526
Art. IV. Pagodas in and near Canton; their names and time of their erection... 535
Art. V. Version of the Old and New Testaments in Chinese: proceedings of the Protestant missionaries at the several ports, and of their delegates at Shánghái relative thereto; resolutions adopted August 1st, 1850..... 544
Art. VI. Tenets of the Budhists, and laws respecting their idols in Siam. By A Correspondent..... 548
Art. VII. Corrections in the Inscription on the Syrian Monument, erected in A. D. 781, contained in Vol. XIV..... 552
Art. VIII. Topography of the province of Kánsuh; its boundaries, mountains, lakes, rivers, divisions, cities, population, productions, historical notices, &c..... 554
Art. IX. Journal of Occurrences: trade with Camboja and Singapore; edict against Christianity by the prefect of Kiáying chau; honorary portals in Canton; proclamation of the insurgents; Lin Tsehsú sent to Kwángsi..... 565

No. 11.

Art. I. Defense of an Essay on the proper rendering of the words Elohim and Theos into the Chinese language. By W. J. Boone. *(Continued from p. 478.)* 569
Art. II. Journal of Occurrences: defeat and dispersion of the insurgents, and memorial respecting them; sailing directions for entering the port of Shánghái; visit of H. M. Str. Reynard to Lewchew; death of Rev. C. Fast near Fuhchau fú; the death of Lin Tsehsú..... 619

No. 12.

Art. I. Defense of an Essay on the proper rendering of the words Elohim and Theos into the Chinese language. By W. J. Boone. *(Concluded from page 618.)* 625
Art. II. Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Thibet, et le Chine, pendant les Annees 1844, 1845, et 1846. Par M. Huc, prêtre missionaire de la Congrégation de St.-Lazare, 2 tomes. Paris, 1850..... 650
Art. III. Resume of the principal occurrences in China during the year 1850..... 674

THE

CHINESE REPOSITORY.

VOL. XIX.—NOVEMBER, 1850.—No. 11.

ART. I. *Defense of an Essay on the proper rendering of the words Elohim and Θεος into the Chinese language.* By W. J. BOONE. *(Continued from page 478.)*

HAVING shown the reasons which forbid us to regard the Chinese *Tien* 天 as the true God, and also why we can not use the phrase *Shángti* to render the words Elohim and Θεος: 1st. because it is a mere title, and we want an absolute name; 2d, because it is the *distinctive* title of a false god; and 3d, because it is a compound term, and we want a simple uncompounded term to express the monotheism of the Bible; I now pass on to the consideration of the last proposition that I proposed to discuss, which reads as follows:—

(*e.*) "Admitting that under the above-mentioned circumstances the generic name of the Chinese gods should be used, if such name can be found, deny that *shin* is this generic name, and affirm on the contrary that the Chinese have neither a name for any being who is truly and properly God, nor any generic name of their gods; and since the words *Elohim* and Θεος *must* be rendered by a generic term, we have no resource but that of transferring the original word."

After making ample trial of *Shángti*, *Tien-ti*, and lastly *Ti*, this is the ground taken by Dr. Medhurst and those who act with him, in their letter of 30th Jan. 1850. They admit that *Elohim* and Θεος are generic terms; they maintain that we need a generic term to render these words, and propose to make one for the Chinese, as they have no generic term for *god* in their language.

The ground taken by Dr. Legge is in every point the opposite of that maintained by Dr. Medhurst and his friends, and also of that maintained in my Essay; and I think it will aid the reader in getting a

clearer view of the whole case to point out this contrariety at this stage, before entering upon the defense of the argument of the Essay.

Dr. L maintains that the Chinese *Shángtí* is truly and properly God. We maintain that the Chinese know no being who is entitled to be called God propriè. Dr. L. maintains that even if Shángtí *is not* the true God, this *title* should be used as the rendering of *Elohim* and Θεος; as such a title can properly belong to God alone, and the words Elohim and Θεος being relative terms—mere titles, which "do not indicate the essence, nor express anything of the *being* of Jehovah"—they must be rendered by a relative term. We maintain, on the contrary, that as the Chinese do not know the true God, we must not use the *name* of any individual god, but the general name of their gods; that this appellative name must be *absolute*, and not merely a *title*, because *Elohim* and Θεος are absolute names that *do* "indicate the *essence*, and express something about the *being* of Jehovah." If it is objected that, according to Chinese usage, this general name has never been employed to designate the Being we design to call by this name; we answer, that the absolute name of a class of invisible beings, who among them govern the world, and are sacrificed to and addressed in prayer by all persons in the empire, in all places, and at all times—a class, who divide among them all the attributes and acts of GOD that the Chinese *have known* or *discoursed about*,—that such absolute term "ought to belong to Jehovah;" that to predicate—*c. g.* the hearing of prayer at the same time in every house in China of any invisible Being but Him is false; therefore this name of right belongs to Him, and we *must* give it to Him, and maintain that He alone can properly be called by this *name;* and this we *must* do to reduce the Chinese polytheism to monotheism.

Dr. Legge's view of the character of the word God differs fundamentally from mine and from that taken by Dr. Medhurst and the other signers of the letter of the 30th Jan., and this difference affects our whole systems. If this word *is*, as Dr. L. contends, only a title of *office* or *dignity*, the mere *exponent* of a relation, and not the *absolute* appellative *name* of *the* Being so designated; it would seem only necessary to decide definitely what *the relation* indicated by this word is, and to render it accordingly. If God mean Creator, this is easily expressed in Chinese; if Ruler, *Ti* 帝 is ready to our hand: indeed, any relationship can be easily expressed. If this too is the character of the word *God*, it can be no objection to the use of the term proposed as its rendering to say, "The Chinese have never so called any Being;"—"This term will give them no idea what sort of *Being* the

one thus designated is;" the answer would be, the word *God* "does not indicate the essence, nor express *anything* of the being of Jehovah." The only question to be asked would be, Does this word or phrase clearly express the fact that the being so designated does sustain the *definite relationship* indicated by the words *Elohim* and Θεος? If so, then it conveys all the information that the term which renders "those *relative words elohim* and θεος" should convey. If Dr. Legge's view of the word *God* is correct, these answers to my mind would be amply sufficient.

If however, the words *Elohim* and Θεος are the *absolute* appellative names of Jehovah, the reader will agree with me that to render them by any mere relative term whatsoever is wholly out of the question; and that if no absolute appellative name of the Chinese gods can be found, then the ground taken by Dr. Medhurst and his friends in their letter of the 30th of January, viz., that we must transfer the original term—we must make such an absolute appellative for the Chinese—is the true solution of our difficulties.

I must confess that ever since the question of rendering *elohim* and θεος by the generic name of the Chinese gods has been agitated, I have had the strongest impression that they must have such a term in their language. That such a people as they should have never conceived of the existence of any gods at all; or that, having the beings, they should have no general name for them—both of these things have seemed incredible to me; and the more I have inquired into the matter from the Chinese around me, and looked into their books, the more firm has my conviction grown that the Chinese people are polytheists, and that *Shin* is the general name of their gods—let us decide by what test we please, who and what the Chinese gods are.

This is the definite point for our consideration at present, and I must be allowed to say that it can only lead to an endless war of words for one party to affirm that "*Shángtí* is not merely the chief god of the Chinese, but is the true God also," to be denied by the other party, while they affirm that *shin* is the generic name of the Chinese gods, and that these *shin* are not mere spirits but gods; to be denied again:—unless both parties will consent to define their terms *God* (propriè) and *god* (impropriè), and make proof according to their definitions.

I have urged above the importance of our regarding the word God, whether, used propriè or impropriè, as the *name* of a *Being* or *Beings* (as the case may be), and not as the mere symbol of an idea. If the views there expressed were correct, they should guide us in the present part of our inquiry. To try the points here at issue, viz., Is

Shángti the true God (God propriè)? and, Are the Chinese *shin* gods and not mere spirits? we should determine what are the *characteristics* of a Being, who is truly and properly God; and also of a being, who is a god according to the polytheistic sense of the word; and then use these characteristics as tests to ascertain whether the *T'ien* of the classics and the Chinese *shin* are respectively God (propriè) and gods. Unless we consent to this, our discussions will only lead to endless logomachy.

When we contend that the *shin* are the gods of the Chinese, Dr. Medhurst replies that they are mere spirits, not gods; the Chinese are polypneumatists, not polytheists. To settle the point, we must inquire what is the CHARACTERISTIC difference between a spirit and a god?

The word *God*, whether used propriè or impropriè, is closely allied to the word *spirit; spirit* may be called the genus; God, god, gods, the species. This we soon perceive if we attempt to form a definition of the word *God*, when used propriè. No matter what attributes of power, wisdom, &c., we may ascribe to a being, if this being be material or corporeal, he is not God (propriè); to be God he must be a spirit possessed of certain characteristic attributes. Let us then look into the matter minutely, and endeavor to ascertain, 1st, The *characteristic* difference between a being who is truly and properly God, and a mere spirit; and 2dly, The characteristic difference between a god, gods, as these words are used by polytheists, and mere spirits.

To the question, "What is God?" the Westminister Assembly of Divines in their Larger Catechism, answer, "God is a Spirit, in and of himself infinite in being, glory, blessedness, and perfection; all sufficient, eternal, unchangeable, incomprehensible, everywhere present, almighty, knowing all things, most wise, most holy, most just, most merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth."

Melancthon defines the word, "Deus est *essentia* spiritualis, intelligens, verax, bona, pura, justa, misericors, liberrima, immensiæ potentiæ et sapientiæ, Pater æternus qui Filium imaginem suam ab eterno genuit, et Filium imago Patris coæterna, et Spiritus sanctus procedens a Patre et Filio."

The first article of the Church of England reads as follows: "There is but one living and true God, everlasting, without body, parts or passions, of infinite power, wisdom, and goodness, the maker and preserver of all things both visible and invisible. And in unity of this

Godhead there be three Persons, of one substance, power and eternity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

These definitions all agree; for the words "without body, parts or passions" are a mere periphrasis for the word *spirit*. According to these definitions, God is a spiritual being, or *essence*, possessed of certain *attributes* which distinguish Him from all *other spirits*. Should it therefore be affirmed of any being that he is God (propriè), the first question should be, Is he a pure spirit, or a compound, corporeal being? Next, Is he a Spirit, "and of himself infinite in being, all-sufficient, eternal," &c., &c. ?*

The Chinese *T'ien* 天, Heaven, the Supreme Ruler, tried by these characteristics as a test, is not God (propriè). He is not self-existent from eternity; he is not the first principle of all things, the making of the heavens and the earth being ascribed to another agency than his by Confucius and his disciples, who teach us all that the Chinese have predicated of him. This, I think, has been sufficiently shown in the previous part of this Defense.

The question then arises, If the Chinese have no being who is truly and properly God, no word in their language which answers to God (propriè), can they have any word that will answer for the rendering of *Elohim* and θεος into Chinese? To this question I answer unhesitatingly, Yes; it is quite possible for a people to have had a *subject* before their minds for centuries, to have discoursed and written much about it, and yet never to have discovered the truth concerning it. It is quite possible for a people, who do not know the true God, to have thought much about the subject of Deity in general, to have a general name for their false gods, and to have sinned greatly against the true God, by the worship of these false ones.

If we look into the argument for the existence of God from the general consent of mankind, as it is presented by most writers, we shall find that the passages cited to prove this point, most of them, refer to this *general view of the subject*, and do not show that heathen nations generally have believed in a simple, self-existent, spiritual being, the Creator of the world and the *author* of all other beings.

Calvin, in his Institutes, writing on this point, thus expresses himself; "Certainly, if there is any quarter, where it may be supposed that God is unknown, the most likely for such an instance to exist is among the dullest tribes, furthest removed from civilization; but, as a heathen tells us, 'there is no nation so barbarous, no race so brutish, as not to

* See Appendix A.

be imbued with the conviction that there is a God.'" From the use of the capital G in both instances in which the word God occurs, we might suppose that Calvin used the word here propriè, i. e. to designate definitely the true God; but his quotations show that this can not be the case. These are,

"Intelligi necesse est *deos*, quoniam insitas eorum vel potius innatas cognitiones habemus. Quæ nobis natura informationem *deorum* ipsorum dedit, eadem insculpsit in mentibus ut eos æternos et beatos haberemus." Cic. de Nat. Deor., *lib* i. *c.* 17. "Itaque inter omnes omnium gentium summa constat; omnibus enim innatum est, et in animo quasi insculptum esse *deos*." *lib.* ii. *c.* 4.

Here the word, in both quotations, which are cited to show that there is no quarter in which "God is unknown" is in the plural, "*deos*," "*deorum*," "*deos*."

Witsius, when commenting on the first Article of the Creed, to prove that the heathen derive a knowledge of God from the contemplation of the heavens, quotes the following proofs; "I shall quote another passage from Cicero: 'Who is so stupid and infatuated,' says he, 'as not to perceive, after having looked up to the heavens, that there are *Gods*, or to ascribe to the operation of chance works which discover so great intelligence that scarcely any one is able, by any art, to trace their order and their revolutions.' But why do I insist on the convictions and declarations of individuals? Zaleucus, the lawgiver of the Locrians, by a law which he enacted, bound all his citizens to acknowledge a *Divinity*, from the contemplation of the heavens. According to the testimony of Diodorus Siculus, 'Zaleucus having been chosen by the people to frame laws, and attempting to confirm them by new sanctions, began by directing their attention to the *celestial Gods*. At the beginning of the preamble to the whole code he says, that the inhabitants of the city are required, first of all to believe and to be firmly persuaded that there *are Gods*, and having attentively considered the heavens and their astonishing magnificence and order, to conclude that they are neither the production of chance, nor the workmanship of man.'"

Here we see that Witsius, to prove that the heathen derive a knowledge of God from his works, and that they acknowledge "a Divinity," quotes sentences in which the existence of Gods is asserted. There is very great looseness of expression on this point in almost every book into which I have looked. Barrow expresses himself much more accurately. His words are, "That in the world there are beings imperceptible to our senses, much superior to us in knowledge and power,

that can perform works above, and contrary to the course of nature, and concerning themselves sometimes to do so for the interests of mankind; for these qualifications and performances deserving extraordinary respect from us, hath been a constant opinion in all places and times, to which sort of beings *some one general name* hath been in all languages assigned, answering to that of *God* among us. Of such beings that there is one, supreme and most excellent, incomparably surpassing in all those attributes of wisdom, and power and goodness; from whom *the rest, and all things beside have derived their beings*, do depend upon, are sustained, and governed; *the author*, I say, *of all beings*, and dispenser of all good; to whom consequently supreme love, reverence, and obedience are due, hath been also the general sense of the most ancient, most wise, and most noble nations among men; to whom therefore, in a peculiar and *eminent manner* the title of *God* (and those which answer thereto) is appropriated; so that when the word is absolutely put, without any adjunct, or limitation, or diminution, he only is meant and understood; to which sometimes for fuller declaration, are the epithets *Optimus*, *Maximus*, *Summus*, *Eternus*, *Omnipotens*, *Dominus*, and the like; the Best, the Greatest, the Most High, the Eternal, the Almighty, the Sovereign God."

Of the almost universal consent of heathen nations to the polytheism stated by Dr. Barrow in the first part of this quotation, there can be, I think, no doubt; with respect to the second point, I am persuaded that a careful examination of what these nations have said for themselves, not trusting to what too-indulgent theists have said for them, will greatly diminish the number of those who can fairly be set down as believing in one Supreme, "from whom the rest *and all things* have derived their beings." Such examination will show that the same nation, at different stages of its existence, is to be placed in a different category with respect to its *explicit* belief of a self-existent, *intelligent*, first cause of all things.

In my Essay, Vol. XVII. page 70, I expressed the opinion that we now "meet *Shin* just where the *Greek philosophers* found Θεος; designating any one of a class of beings who are all regarded as proper objects of worship." The correctness of this opinion has been questioned, and it is of such importance that it demands our consideration. Above, (on pp. 423, 424,) we have considered the probability there would be of our finding the posterity of any of the rebels who were scattered abroad on the face of the earth from Babel, say B.C. 2554, retaining a knowledge of the true God, when they come up to our notice on the pages of profane history, say in the 8th, 9th, or 10th century before Christ.

We saw above, that the ancestors of the chosen people, and the nations around them, had fallen into idolatry before the time of Abraham. These facts are referred to for the purpose of repelling the presumption which many seem to entertain that patriarchal tradition will prove so efficacious a means of transmitting this truth, that we shall, yea, must, find a knowledge of God (understanding this word propriè) among every people, in the first records we have of their existence as a nation. A calm consideration of the circumstances of the case, it seems to me, removes any such presumption, and produces on the contrary a conviction that we should come to the examination of the early documents of any people, when we desire to learn what their religious creed was, with minds perfectly unbiased, and base our decision *wholly* upon the facts made known to us. If we do this in the case of the Greeks and Romans, we shall, I think, conclude that their knowledge of a monadic Θεος was owing, not to *tradition*, but to their philosophy; or, at any rate, if derived from tradition, that this tradition was not handed down from the patriarchs, by their *own ancestors*, and recorded by their own *poets* and other *early writers*, but was gained by their philosophers at a comparatively modern date in their foreign travels.

If we take Homer, Hesiod, and Orpheus as the oldest Greek authors whose productions have come down to us, how much do we find in these writers "of a Spiritual Being in and of himself" existing from eternity, the Creator of the world, and the Author of everything extrinsic to himself? "In the Homeric poems, Ocean is termed the origin of *the gods* and of all things, though Jupiter is commonly described as the Father of gods and men."*

"Homer represents Father Oceanus as the generator of all things."† In what part of the Iliad or Odyssey shall we find a being called Θεος who is superior to Ζευς, who is self-existent; the Creator of heaven and earth and ocean; of Ζευς, and of all the gods?

"First in order of time (we are told by Hesiod) came Chaos; next Gæa, the broad, firm and flat Earth, with deep and dark Tartarus at her base. Eros (Love), the subduer of gods as well as men, came immediately afterwards. From Chaos sprung Erebus and Nyx; from these latter Æther and Hemera. Gæa also gave birth to Uranos, equal in breadth to herself, in order to serve both as an overarching vault to her, and as a residence for the immortal gods; she further

* Thirlwall's History of Greece.

† Brucker, Historia Critica Philosophiæ, Tom. II. quoted in Elton's Remains of Hesiod.

produced the mountains, habitations of the divine nymphs, and Pontus, the barren and billowy sea. Then Gæa intermarried with Uranos, and from this union came a numerous offspring—twelve Titans and Titanides; three Cyclopes and three Hekatoncheïres, or beings with a hundred hands each. The Titans were Oceanus, Koios, Krios, Hyperiōn, Iapetos, and Kronos: the Titanides, Theia, Rhea, Themis, Mnemosyne, Phœbe, and Tethys." Kronos and Rhea intermarry; "but Kronos foreboded to himself destruction from one of his own children, and accordingly as soon as any of them were born, he immediately swallowed them, and retained them in his own belly. In this manner had the five first been treated, and Rhea was on the point of being delivered of Zeus. Grieved and indignant at the loss of her children, she applied for counsel to her father and mother, Uranos and Gæa, who aided her to conceal the birth of Zeus. They conveyed her by night to Lyctus in Crete, hid the new-born child in a woody cavern on Mount Ida, and gave to Kronos, in place of it, a stone wrapped in swaddling-clothes, which he greedily swallowed, believing it to be his child. Thus was the safety of Zeus ensured."* And this being is henceforth to be the chief god, the Father of gods and men.

There could surely be no knowledge of a self-existent, understanding Being, who was the first principle of all things, among those who could write and believe such a cosmogony as that above given. If Homer had believed in the existence of any being who could truly and properly be called God, could he have written Ωκεανον Γε θεων γενεσιν, και μητερα Τηθυν?—*Iliad*, XIV. 210. The Homeric and Hesiodic gods are to us a mere fable, but the whole story to the men of their own times was not romance, but history—sacred history.

"Homer and Hesiod were the grand authorities in the Pagan world respecting theogony; but in the Iliad and Odyssey nothing is found except passing allusions and implications, and even in the Hymns (which were commonly believed in antiquity to be the productions of the same author as the Iliad and the Odyssey), there are only isolated, unconnected narratives. Accordingly, men habitually took their information respecting their theogonic antiquities from the Hesiodic poem, where it was ready laid out before them; and the legends consecrated in that work acquired both an extent of circulation and a firm hold on the national faith, such as independent legends could seldom or never rival. Moreover, the scrupulous and sceptical Pagans, as well as the open assailants of Paganism in later times, derived their

* Grote's History of Greece, Vol. I. pages 5, 6—8.

subjects of attack from the same source; so that it has been absolutely necessary to recount in their naked simplicity the Hesiodic stories, in order to know what it was that Plato deprecated and Xenophanos denounced."*

It was philosophical inquiry, a better acquaintance with nature, more correct views of geography, &c., &c., which led the philosophers of the 5th and 6th centuries before the Christian era, to doubt the story of the gods which was so firmly believed by all in the days of Homer and Hesiod. "The honor of having *first* represented God as the intelligent cause of the universe is ascribed to Anaxagoras by the ancients. . . . .That he maintained an infinite mind to be the author of all motion and life, is attested by many ancient authorities. Plato expressly asserts that Anaxagoras taught the existence of 'a Disposing Mind, the cause of all things.' Νοῦς ὁ διακοσμῶν ϛε και παντων αἴτιος. Aristotle gives it as his doctrine that mind is the first principle of all things, pure, simple and unmixed; that it possesses within itself the united powers of thought and motion; and that it gives motion to the universe, and is the cause of whatever is fair and good. Plutarch confirms this account of the doctrine of Anaxagoras, and shows wherein it differed from that of his predecessors. 'The Ionic philosophers,' says he, 'who appeared before Anaxagoras, made fortune or blind necessity, that is, the fortuitous or necessary motion of the particles of matter, the first principle in nature; but Anaxagoras affirmed that a pure mind, perfectly free from all material concretions, governs the universe.' The infinite Mind, or Deity, which his *predecessors* had confounded with matter, making them one universe, Anaxagoras conceived to have a separate and independent existence, and to be simple, pure, intelligence, capable of forming the eternal mass of matter according to his pleasure. Thus he assigned an adequate cause for the existence of the visible world." *Enfield*, Vol. I. p. 161.

Here we have, if this account may be relied on, this great truth of the existence of an intelligent mind or God, separate from matter, first asserted in Greece in the 5th century B.C. The word Θεος was much older than this. Homer, and Hesiod, and Orpheus had used it. If, as used by them, this word designated, when standing absolutely, an understanding, spiritual being, who is self-existent and the former of the universe, how could any respectable ancient authority "ascribe to Anaxagoras the honor of having first represented God (Θεος) as the intelligent cause of the universe?"

---

* Grote's History of Greece, Vol. I.

If this honor is denied to Anaxagoras, and it be maintained that Thales and Pythagoras are also theists, it will not alter the force of our argument that Θεος was not used by Homer, Hesiod, and the earliest Greeks, as the name of a self-existent, spiritual Being; for if this had been the general belief in the age of Homer, how can we account for the existence of any controversy with respect to the theism of Thales and others of the Ionic sect, and for the direct assertions above quoted that Anaxagoras was the *first among the Greeks*, who conceived of mind as detached from matter?

If the belief in a monadic Θεος was the ancient traditionary faith of Greece, handed down to them by their ancestors from the patriarchal age, and not either the fruit of philosophic speculation, or a tenet of foreign importation, how can we account for the treatment of this very Anaxagoras and the Greek philosophers generally by the *common people*, who are sure to adhere most firmly to the tradition of their fathers? Cudworth says, "It is certain the vulgar in all ages have been very ill judges of theists and atheists; as for example, Anaxagoras the Clazomenian, though he was the *first* of all the Ionic philosophers (unless Thales ought to be excepted,) who made an infinite mind to be a principle, *that is, asserted a Deity according to the true notion of it;* yet he was, notwithstanding, cried down for an atheist, merely because he affirmed the sun to be 'a mass of fire,' or 'a fiery globe,' and 'the moon to be an earth;' that is, because he denied them to be animated, and endued with understanding souls, and consequently to be gods. So likewise, Socrates was both accused and condemned for atheistical impiety, as denying all gods, though nothing was pretended to be proved against him but only this, that he did teach that those were *not true gods* which the city worshiped, and in the room thereof introduced *other new gods.*"* What is this, but saying in other words, that he was condemned for rejecting the old traditionary gods for the new philosophic ones; among whom the monadic Θεος is to be included?

If Θεος when standing absolutely in Homer and Hesiod designates God (propriè), and not some particular god, either Ζευς or some other, to be inferred from the context, how can we account for the facts mentioned above, and for a thousand others that might readily be brought forward?

The truth is, we are prone to read old writers with our modern eyes. Polytheism seems infinitely foolish to us; and it is inconceivable, in

* Cudworth's Intellectual System, Vol. I. page 190.

this age of philosophy, and among Christian men, how any could rest content without clear and definite views of the *first cause of all things*; hence, if the ancients talk only of material, physical causes, and *keep silence* about a self-existent mind, many are impelled by their kindness to give them credit for knowing all about such an intelligent first cause, and suggest that they only forgot to mention it in their cosmogonies. Others again, if they meet with the word θεος standing absolutely (in any old writer, as Homer), and can not readily infer from the context *what* god is meant, immediately jump to the conclusion that it is used propriè. They do not stay to inquire whether any such Being, as Him whom we call God (propriè), *was known and worshiped in the Homeric age*, (without which fact being established it seems over hasty to conclude that the writer had this Being in his mind, when he wrote the word θεος in question) but decide at once that this being is designated, because, by θεος standing absolutely, Greek writers of a *later age* unquestionably did mean the intelligent First Cause.

To jump thus to conclusions without examining the premises can serve no purpose but to deceive ourselves. If we wish to ascertain whether the Greek word θεος is used in Homer as the name of a being who is truly and properly God, we must inquire whether he and the Greeks of his age knew such a being, and called Him by this name; and not content ourselves with merely finding a few instances in which this word stands absolutely, and thereupon refer it at once to such a Being, without taking the pains to inquire whether Homer knew any such Being or not, before we determine that he wrote about Him. From the Greek theogonies, from all their early writings, and from the gradual manner in which the idea of a monadic θεος grew clearer among the philosophers: from the reception this view met with from the common people, and from the fact that it never was popular among *them* even down to the time that Paul preached at Athens, I am satisfied that it was not a *native traditionary* doctrine in Greece, and that the word θεος was in use among them, as the name of a class of invisible beings superior to men, who were regarded as proper objects of worship, long before Anaxagoras, or some other philosopher, *first* used it as the name by which to designate "a disposing Mind, the cause of all things." This is the reason that induced me to say in my Essay, that we find the Chinese *shin* where the Greek Philosophers found θεος, designating any one (as shown by the context or some qualifying word) of a class of Beings, who are all regarded as proper objects of worship. Whether I am correct or not in the opinion

that θεος in the Homeric age meant a *god*, and if used κατ' εξοχην, designated the Homeric Ζευς, and not the Being who is truly and properly God, still I think that the position for which I contend that the general name of the false gods of a people should be used as the appellative name of such a Being, when He is to be *first* made known to them, can be shown to be correct. That the Chinese are in this position has been already sufficiently shown. We have seen that the *Tien* 天 of the Shû King, worshiped alternately with *Ti* 地 Earth, in the *kiáu* sacrifice can not be accounted God (propriè) and I think it is certain that there has no Anaxagoras yet arisen among the philosophers of China, who has clearly taught an intelligent first cause of the heavens and the earth, or who has pointed out any Being, who is the author of all *other* beings extrinsic to himself.

If my idea, however, is correct, that Homer, Hesiod and the Greeks of their age, used θεος, as the general name of their deities, designating any one of them indifferently by this name, to be determined by the context, or occasionally using it when standing absolutely to designate Ζευς, the highest Being known to them; then, when the philosophers learned from foreign travel, or from their own reflections, that there was an intelligent First Cause, *a Being* wholly different from Ζευς, and one who had not been spoken of before; the question must have arisen, by what name He should be called? Anaxagoras called his "Disposing Mind, the cause of all things" Θεος, and from this grew up the monadic θεος of the Greek philosophers.

But whether we may consider this course, viz., that of calling God (propriè) by the general name of their objects of worship, when He is to be first made known to a heathen people ignorant of Him, to be sustained by the analogous action of the Greek philosophers or not; it can, I think, be clearly shown by independent reasoning to be the correct course to be pursued under such circumstances. Because men fail to discover a "FIRST CAUSE," to which they ascribe spirituality, free-will, intelligence, omnipotence, &c., we must not conclude that they have had no thoughts on the subject of Deity. "No one," says Morrell, "will affirm that the earlier ages of the world were destitute of any searchings after God. So far from that, everything in the mythological period was wondrously gilded with the divine. The only thing to be noticed is that men in those ages conversed mainly with nature; that they formed their conceptions of the *numina divina* without much reflection, and chiefly from nature; and that the argument from this source resulted more frequently than not, in *polytheism*. Can we say that the process was illogical? I think

not. Confine our view to nature only with its endless variations, and what is there unnatural in admitting the whole hierarchy of Olympus? Nay, history and present experience prove, that under such circumstances, the polytheistic hypothesis is by far the most acceptable to the human understanding. Even on this ground, however, the chief share in the argument is derived from the mind or the consciousness. The irresistible belief we have of causation is a primary law of our consciousness, and the first attempt we make to hypostatize the cause of the universe around us, is the transference of our own forms of intelligence, and our own personality into the conception of that vast architect, or hierarchy of architects, by whom the world was constructed. The theistic argument then in which the appeal to nature is the prominent feature, ends at best in the idea of a Δημιουργος."*

Men thus working out for themselves polytheistic systems everywhere, we find false gods in possession of the field, and in teaching them monotheism, it is as in teaching men to become good—we meet them in a state the opposite of that to which we desire to lead them; as in the one case we must say, "cease to do evil, learn to do well," so in the other, the burden of our preaching must be, "put away your *false gods;* learn to love, honor, and adore Jehovah the *true God.*" To enforce this exhortation, it seems plain to me, Jehovah must be called by the same name as the false gods who are to be put away. He is *the truth* of the *very thing* of which they are the *falsehood;* and we shall succeed most easily in conveying to polytheists a general correct idea of Him, by representing Him as taking the place of *all* their gods, rather than that of any particular one, however exalted that one may be. We *must* teach that He can afford them protection, succor, &c.—yea, and ten thousand times more than all their gods put together were ever supposed to afford; that He is the alone God, there is no place left for any other: hence, we give Him the *common name of all,* and write over our system mono-theism.

While this general name is the best word by which to teach a people who have hitherto been ignorant of Him, a knowledge of the true God, the use of this word is absolutely *necessary* to forbid the false worship in which they have *previously* indulged. The great sin with which a missionary must charge a polytheistic people, the sin which, when God pours out his Spirit, and carries home the preached word to the hearts of his heathen hearers, they will feel more deeply than all others, is that of having worshiped false gods to the dishonoring

* Morrell's History of Modern Philosophy, page 738.

of the true God. With this sin we must, here in China, charge our hearers; but what conviction of sin could be expected to be produced from a sermon or tract charging the Chinese with the worship of false *Alohos* or false Θεοι? Would not their answer be that so far from having sinned in this particular, they had never so much as heard there were any such beings or things in the universe?

If we maintained that the Chinese had never had this *subject* up before their minds so as to have predicated anything either right or wrong about it, then it would be consistent to contend that we must either transfer a foreign word, or invent a new Chinese character to represent this perfectly new *subject:* but if we admit that the Chinese have worshiped false gods, then we admit that they actually *have* had the *subject* up before their minds, though under a false aspect, and we must inquire by what name they themselves have called *this subject:* for we may rest assured we can best teach them the truth with respect to *this subject*, by predicating said truth of the *Chinese name* thereof.

We must teach them what their errors with respect to this subject are; so that, being properly instructed, they shall understand that the Being designated is *one*, not many as they have incorrectly supposed; that He is self-existent from eternity, the Creator of all beings and things, &c. Now to point out *their past errors*, to convict them of *their past sins* with respect to this *subject*, and to warnt hem against the false gods they have been in the habit of worshiping, of what avail will the use of either of the foreign words, *Aloho* or Θεος be? They have never written or spoken of any *Alohos* or Θεοι; they have never worshiped them; it would be a mere waste of breath to preach against false *Alohos* or false θεοι.

I need not however detain the reader any longer to prove that the generic name of *god*, if such exists in the language of a polytheistic people, should be used to render *Elohim*, if such can be found, for Dr. Medhurst and his friends expressly contend for this, and differ from us only in denying that the Chinese have such a word in their language. Dr. Legge insists upon the use of a native appellative in opposition to any transferred term, differing from us only in contending that this appellative must be a relative, and not an absolute term. The points on which we differ from Dr. Legge have been sufficiently discussed: let us now inquire if the Chinese have any generic or absolute appellative name for *god* in their language.

As in the case of the word *God* when used propriè, we inquired what is the difference between a being who is truly and properly God and a mere spirit, so here we shall inquire what is the *characteristic*

difference between a spirit and a god. I shall pursue this method as the shortest course leading to the most direct issue. The *shin* worshiped by the Chinese are admitted to be spirits: gods are spirits; so far we are agreed: the point on which we differ is, are they mere spirits, or are they, in addition to being spiritual beings, regarded by the Chinese as something more—as gods? To state the matter logically, we are agreed as to the genus—*spirit;* but differ as to the species—*god.* We must therefore inquire, what is the differentia or characteristic of the species, for the genus, plus the differentia, gives us the species. In my Essay, I contended that the best mark and distinguishing indication of the differentia or characteristic was, "supposed to be a proper object of religious worship." If this be the true characteristic, as it is admitted that the *shin* are spirits, I have only to show that the Chinese regard them as proper objects of worship, to prove that the Chinese *shin* are gods, and not mere spirits.

I may illustrate the propriety of pursuing this method of proof, viz. Inquiring what is the characteristic difference between a god and a spirit, by taking an analogous case.

If asked the meaning of the word *man*, I should answer, It is the name of a class of beings.—*Qu.* What kind of beings, spiritual or what? *Ans.* A class of animals.—*Qu.* What kind of animal? *Ans.* Rational.—Here then, in the words *animal* and *rational*, we have reached the characteristics of this class of beings.

If we were contending whether a word in a foreign language should be rendered "*man*" or "*animal*," the point to which inquiry should be directed would be, Are the animals in question rational or not? It would be beside the mark to inquire whether the word, in the foreign language, corresponded etymologically with *Adam* (red), —*anthropos* (to turn the eyes to heaven)—*homo* (*qui ex humo*, earth-derived)—or *man* (etymology not known); for the derivation of this word differs in each language above quoted; nor does that of either afford us the slightest hint that our tests would be for genus, *animal*, or for species *rational.* To state our parallel: If asked the meaning of the word *God*, I should answer, That this word is used for purposes so distinct that we must divide its meaning into two classes, viz. propriè and impropriè, and then we shall be prepared to answer in conformity to our case above stated. If asked then, What is the meaning of the word *God* when used propriè, I answer: It is the name of a spiritual being.—*Qu.* What kind of spiritual being? *Ans.* Self-existent, Almighty, &c., &c. If, in the next place, asked the meaning of the word *god* when used impropriè, *Ans.* The name of a class of spirit-

ual beings.—*Qu.* What kind of spiritual beings? *Ans.* Spiritual beings, other than the true God, who (whether self-existent or dependent) are considered by men proper objects of worship.

Here, as in the case of the word *man*, we fix upon our characteristics from our knowledge of the two classes we are comparing: the etymology of the word for *God*, like that of the word for *man*, in different languages varying so much, and being so uncertain in Hebrew, Greek, and English, that we can derive no help from thence.

The illustration afforded by the word *man* makes plain the propriety of our calling for the characteristic test between gods and spirits, that our controversy may not degenerate into a mere war of words. Unhappily, on the point before us, we are not so agreed as we should be, with respect to the test to be employed to ascertain whether a given animal was a man or not.

In his "Reply to Dr. Boone" (Vol. XVII. p. 499), Dr. Medhurst says, "Wewould suggest a different definition, viz., The name of the being, or class of beings, to whom the Chinese ascribe the highest attributes. For the following reasons: A god is a being possessed of divine attributes.....Worship is not necessary to his being or his nature; he may never be worshiped, and yet be God.

"The genus of gods (supposing such a genus to exist) is the class of beings possessed of divine attributes.

"The generic name for *God* is the name of the class of beings supposed to possess divine attributes.

"The attributes possessed by a divine being are in many respects the same in kind with the attributes possessed by other intelligent beings, only differing in degree. Thus intelligent beings in general possess some power, wisdom, goodness, &c., but a divine being or beings must be conceived to possess these attributes in the highest perfection.

"There are some attributes, however, which are peculiar to a divine Being or beings, such as the originating and governing of all things.

"Religious worship is the ascribing honor to a being or beings possessed of divine attributes; the qualities or the station of the being or beings must first be allowed, before worship can be paid. Hence the possession of attributes is the primary, and the offering of worship the secondary idea of God."

I am glad to observe that Dr. M. would make attributes—essential attributes, "power, wisdom, goodness, &c.,"—not relationships, the tests of divinity. From his saying, "A divine being or beings must

be conceived to possess these attributes in the highest perfection," and that "those peculiar to a divine being or beings are the *originating* and governing of *all things*," he must have had the word *God* (as understood by us propriè) before his mind when he wrote this; for he surely could not contend that all the Greek Θεοι, for instance, had "power, wisdom and *goodness* in the *highest perfection*," or that they all had something to do with the "*originating* and governing of *all things*." Accordingly, on reflection, Dr. M. gave up this view, and adopted that of Cudworth, Mosheim, and others, which was presented by me, and in this he was joined by Messrs. Stronach and Milne, and his other friends, who signed the letter of the 30th January; for they therein maintain (see p. 11) that we must have a generic term, "which, while it is capable of being used for the highest being of whom they have any conception, includes all worshiped beings, and goes no farther." This is also apparent from the definition which they give of the transferred word *Aloho*, in a subsequent part of this letter; viz., "the name of whatever men sacrifice to and worship."

Dr. Legge contends that I make "God" and "worshiped being" interchangeable terms, and styles this "A blunder, of which the best that can be said is that it is a very bad use of the second kind of metonomy which puts the effect for the cause. The Supreme Being is not God because He is worshiped, but He is worshiped because He is God." Dr. Legge's view here is precisely that quoted from Dr. Medhurst's Reply, "the *qualities* or the *station* of the being or beings must be *first* allowed *before worship can be paid*." Dr. L. seems to have fallen into a strange confusion of mind in the part of his argument quoted above.

In my Essay, I made the fact of being worshiped a test to ascertain whether a given being is regarded as a god or a mere spirit; this is very different from saying that "God" and "worshiped being" are interchangeable terms. With respect to our proposing "religious worship" as the characteristic test by which to distinguish a god from a mere spirit, if Drs. Medhurst and Legge are correct in their theory of worship, there can be no doubt of it. Dr. M. says, "Religious worship is the ascribing honor to a being or beings *possessed of divine attributes*." If then we find a man worshiping any being, may we not use the fact of his offering worship to this being, to infer that said being is "possessed (in his estimation at least) of divine attributes?" And if, as Dr. M. says, "the qualities or the station of the being must be *first allowed*, before worship can be paid," must we not, where the worship *is* paid, infer the existence (in the brain of the votary, if no

where else) of the *qualities* or *station* so allowed, in the being worshiped?

Or, let us take Dr. L.'s illustration. "The Supreme Being is not God because he is worshiped, but he is worshiped because he is God." Now then substitute "a being," for "the Supreme Being," and "a god" for "God," and what Dr. L. says, will prove the propriety of using the test I propose. Remember, our object is not to prove that a being who is worshiped *is* a god (for I am firmly persuaded there is only one God in the universe), but that he is a god in the eye of his worshipers; and then, with Dr. L.'s statement changed as above suggested, the matter will stand thus: "A being is not a god because he is worshiped, but he is worshiped because he is (*i. e.* in the mind of his worshiper) a god." May we not then take the fact that a being is worshiped to prove that in the opinion of his votaries he is a god? Instead of putting the effect for the cause, is not this, *according to the theory of worship of both Drs. M. and L.*, from the *effect* inferring the *cause?*

To this explanation of my meaning, Dr. L. thus replies in his Letters at p. 34:—"From this, and similar passages, and the general strain of his Essay, I supposed, when I published my Argument, that he understood *God* as meaning *object of worship.* I could not otherwise make out any connection in his reasoning. I have been given to understand, however, that his reasoning is not that *God* means object of worship, or that *Shin* means object of worship, but that the *Shin* being worshiped, are to be regarded as the Gods of China, and that therefore *Shin* is the generic name for *God;* and God, a God, and Gods, ought to be translated by *Shin.* If it be granted to him that the *Shin* are to be regarded as the Gods of China, I do not see the bridge from that to the conclusion that *Shin* is to be translated God, or that *Elohim* and Θεος are to be rendered by *Shin.* We may regard *rice* as the oatmeal of China, but if I were to translate a treatise upon oatmeal into Chinese, I should write to little purpose if I spoke all through of *fan.* If the first sentence were, "Oatmeal is a farinaceous food, much used in certain countries," the Chinese could not possibly understand me of anything but *rice.* Unless *Shin* and *God* have the same meaning, Dr. Boone's reasoning is too trifling to be examined at length."

To judge whether my reasoning be too trifling or not to deserve an examination, the Reader should observe what the question at issue between Dr. Medhurst, Dr. Legge and myself is. Dr. Legge, says *shin* does not mean what *Elohim* and Θεος mean. They are correctly ren-

dered in English by *God*, and *Shin* by *spirit*. We can no more translate *Elohim* and Θεος into Chinese by *Shin*, than we could translate them into English by spirit." This is Dr. L.'s assertion. Mine is, that, though *Shin* does not answer to Elohim and Θεος when these words are used propriè (having never been used as the name of a self-existent, almighty, spiritual Being), still it does answer to these words when used impropriè, and should therefore be rendered into English, not a spirit, spirits, but a god, gods. The question is, How the Chinese regard the class of beings they call *Shin;* what are they to them—gods or mere spirits? Dr. Legge says they regard them as a class of mere spirits; I say, as a class of gods. Hereupon I propose as a test the characteristic difference between gods and mere spirits, given by such men as Cudworth, Mosheim, and Waterland. I show that, according to Dr. Medhurst's theory of worship, and that advanced by Dr. Legge himself in the very context in which he charges me with "blundering," and putting "the effect for the cause," &c., that this test is CHARACTERISTIC; that worship does imply the belief on the part of the worshiper of "divine attributes" in the Being worshiped; and Dr. L. instead of pointing out my "blunder," and showing how I had put the effect for the cause, contents himself with saying, "Dr. Boone's reasoning is too trifling to be examined at length."*

---

* The difference between Dr. Legge and myself here, arises from the different view we take of the word *God*. He argues as if this word were a simple, incomplex term, the symbol of an idea, and demands a word in Chinese that conveys *this idea*. I, on the contrary, regarding the word *God* as a complex term, the absolute name of a Being (when used propriè), and of a class of beings (when used impropriè by polytheists), fancy, that instead of looking for the name of *this idea*, what we want is, *just the name* of said Being or beings as the case may be; so that if a word in any foreign language is proposed as corresponding to this word, I ask, is the *being* of whom this foreign word is the *name*, the same as *the Being* of whom our English word GOD is the name; if so then, the foreign word answers to, or *means* (if you like) the same thing as our English word *God* means when used propriè: If the question be with respect to the word *god*, as used impropriè by polytheists, when it is the name, not of one Being merely, but a name common to a class of beings; then I ask, does the class of beings of whom this foreign word is the name, answer to the class of beings called by us, a god, gods. It is of no importance *how* any people came to give the name in question to the Supreme Being, or to the class of beings of whom we are speaking, the only question of practical importance is, Is this word in said language the absolute name of the self-existent first cause, the all-wise author of all things on the one hand; or on the other, the absolute name of the class of beings of whom we are speaking?

There is one additional point to which I would advert in this note; the peculiarity of the beings of whom we are speaking; they are mere imaginary beings, and not like Dr. Legge's oatmeal and rice. They have no existence except in the minds of their blinded votaries; hence it is that we must look into the mind of their worshipers, and not to anything in *rerum naturâ* to find our mark or test of the differentia between them and mere spirits. The differentia between spirits and gods consists no doubt in the one having "divine attributes" as Dr.

In his Letters, at p. 21, Dr. L. says, "We worship because of the *qualities* we apprehend in the *object* of our adoration. These fill us with awe, and of that awe, worship is the fitting expression." That this is the correct theory of worship will perhaps be denied by none. Dr. South, in his Sermon on "Natural Religion," says, "The ground and reason of *all worship* is an opinion of power and will in the person worshiped to answer and supply our desires; which he can not possibly do unless he first apprehend them." And this, I conceive, to be the reason at once why worship is the best test by which to distinguish between a god and a mere spirit; and why it is emphatically that "glory" which God will not give to another. To suppose that an invisible being can "apprehend," attend to, and answer the prayers of all his votaries in all parts of the world, is investing him with attributes of infinity, such as omnipresence, omniscience, &c., &c.; and when you add to this, what the Chinese *predicate* of their *Shin*, and what seems to be implied in all religious worship, such a knowledge of the thoughts and purposes of the human heart that the object worshiped can not be imposed upon by an insincere worshiper; we perceive that the act of worship implies a belief of the existence of many attributes in the object worshiped, which can belong properly to the true God only, and which it is robbing him of "his glory" to ascribe to any other being.

Let us, for instance, take the case of the *Tsái Shin*, 財神, god of Wealth, who, though not of high rank, is yet perhaps more worshiped than any other *shin* in China. This *shin*, we may suppose, is often

---

Medhurst says, while the others have not. But where are we to look for the proofs that the *shin* possess these attributes? I answer, To the acts of their worshipers, that we may learn how they *regard* them, as it is only in their minds that they have any existence at all. The proof to be made of the differentia in this case is similar to that in the case of murder, in remarking on which Dr. Whately observes "that the *differentia* which *constitutes* the species, and the mark by which the species are known (in some cases) are not the same: *e. g.* Murder the differentia of which is, that it be committed 'with malice of forethought;' this can not be directly ascertained; and therefore we *distinguish* murder from any other homicide by circumstances of preparation, &c., which are not in reality the differentia, but indications of the differentia, *i. e.* the grounds for concluding that the malice did exist." So in this case; while we admit the differentia to be "divine attributes," if Dr. Medhurst pleases, we propose "religious worship" as the "mark," the circumstance which serves as an "indication of the differentia," "the ground for our concluding" that "the divine attributes" are possessed by this imaginary being, as he stands complete in the mind of his worshiper, the only place where he has any existence. We have never proposed religious worship as the only mark of distinction between a Being who is truly and properly God, and a mere spirit. To make out a being to be God propriè, we propose to Dr. Legge to show that he is a self-existent spirit, the author of all other spirits, and of everything extrinsic to himself.

called on at the same moment by many thousands, who are separated hundreds of miles apart. The knowledge of human hearts he must be supposed to have to attend to, and appreciate all these prayers, and the control he must have of all sublunary affairs to enable him to cause matters to work together for the wealth of all who worship him, must be most absolute, and imply power little short of infinite. Now it would appear that this dependence upon any beings without the compass of civil intercourse, this calling upon them for help, this belief in their ability to hear and answer our prayers, is that which constitutes the violation of the First Commandment, and which makes the beings so regarded *gods* in the eye of this commandment and throughout the Scriptures; and it is this same point that Cudworth, Mosheim, and Waterland regard as the distinctive characteristic of the gods of pagan Greece and Rome.

If we are not to contend about mere words, we must agree upon some test by which the claim of *Shángti* to be considered the true God, and of *shin* to be the general name of the Chinese gods may be tried respectively. I have proposed tests for trying the claims of both, not framed by myself to suit my own purposes in this controversy, but quoted from the works of the most learned men that have written on these subjects. If Drs. Medhurst and Legge do not agree to these tests, let them be set aside by argument, and let something *definite* be proposed in their place. Let them furnish a definition of the word *God*, when used proprièe, that shall commend itself to the judgment of those who are interested in this controversy, and then show that the Chinese *T'ien* is truly and properly God, according to this definition; or, let them give us a definition of the word *god*, *gods*, that will not cut off the Greek and Roman gods as well as the Elohim of the Old Testament, and I will engage to stand to it. If any other attribute than that of *being supposed a proper object of worship* is necessary to constitute a god in the eyes of polytheists, and they will mention it, I think I may venture to promise that we will prove the *Shin* have this or these attributes also. But to convince us that worship is the *characteristic* mark of a god, we need only look at the 30,000 gods of the Greeks and Romans, and to the Elohim of the Old Testament, and endeavor to find anything else that is common to them all. Therefore we say, that if we wish to distinguish between mere spirits and gods, the test is worship; the worshiped spirit is a god, and this applies even to inanimate things, to wooden images—a worshiped image is a god, *e. g.* Is. xliv. 17, "And the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image; he falleth down unto it and worshipeth it, and saith, *Deliver me, for thou art my god.*"

To prove that the *shin* are the gods of the Chinese, we show that the class of beings so called have been worshiped from the earliest annals of the Empire to the present time; that the highest being known to them, viz., *T'ien* heaven, and *Ti* earth (worshiped at the solstices in the highest sacrifice, called *kiáu*); the beings who preside over the five elements (the immediate producers of all things, styled the Five Rulers); those who preside over the land and grain; the governor of the seas; the dispenser of wealth; the bestower of longevity; the tutelary guardian of their cities; the patrons of every kind of their handicraftsmen; in short, every invisible being, who is invoked by them in times of either joy or sorrow, is included in and *worshiped under this general name Shin.*

We show that in explaining the phrase *Shángtí*, the title of their chief deity, they make him neither more nor less than the chief of their *shin.* "*Shángtí*, the Supreme Ruler, is *the Shin* of heaven." "*Shángtí* is the most honorable of the *shin.*" "Expansive Heaven, the Supreme Ruler (Shángtí) is the most honorable of the hundred shin," *i. e.* of all the shin. "They used the Yen-sz' to sacrifice to Expansive Heaven, the Supreme Ruler (Shángtí); this offering did not belong *to any other shin.*" The chief of the shin is thus described:—"*The greatest of the celestial Shin* is called Expansive Heaven, the Supreme Ruler *(Shángtí).* He (this chief shin) is also called the celestial, august, great Ruler; also the GREAT ONE, or Unity, "*Tái yih* 太一." "The Great ONE 太一 is the most honorable of the Shin of heaven." "The Shin of heaven *(t'ien shin* 天神) is *most honorable*, and (a Being) with whom *none* can be compared."

We show that from the time of Shun, there has been an officer appointed to superintend the rites and ceremonies used at the worship of this class of beings; that of the ceremonies thus used in the national worship, we are told, "the principal object of these ceremonies is to serve the *shin*;" and that "in regulating their ceremonies, those which were *used in the service of the shin* were considered *most important*," thereby excluding all idea of the existence of a class of beings who are above this class called *shin*, and who being worshiped with higher ceremonies, are therefore to be considered the gods of the Chinese. In the Shú King, we find the phrase "shin and men," just as we meet with the phrase "gods and men" in the Greek poets.

These facts appear to me amply sufficient to sustain my position that *Shin* is the general name of the Chinese gods—the absolute appellative name for *god* in the Chinese language, and to show that this word answers to the word Θεος in the Homeric and Hesiodic poems.

While they deny none of these facts, Drs. Medhurst and Legge maintain that the Chinese *shin* are mere spirits, not gods, and to this point I must devote the remainder of this Defense. Before attempting however, to answer their objections, I would only ask the reader to take away, in his mind, from the Chinese pantheon all the beings mentioned above, who are called *shin*, and *who are worshiped under this* NAME, and see what place is left for a class of gods after this. And if Drs. M. and L. contend that the beings abovementioned are not gods, but mere spirits, I here call upon them to point out to us who the Chinese gods are; to tell us by whom they are worshiped; what officer is appointed by the state to superintend such worship; by what general name these gods are called, and where—in what classic, their worship is enjoined?

When we insist upon the fact that the *shin* have been worshiped from the earliest times, as proof that they are gods in the eyes of the Chinese; and we contend, that, as Shángtí, the Wú Tí, and all the objects *worshiped* by the Confucianists, Yuh-hwáng Tá-tí the chief god, and all the objects worshiped by the Táuists, are *worshiped* under this *name*, therefore the Chinese are polytheists, and *shin* is the general name of their gods: Dr. Medhurst replies, the Chinese are polypneumatists not polytheists, because of such worship, as the Shin worshiped are spirits, not gods. Here then, unless we can find some characteristic test to decide our dispute, we may wrangle for ever over this point. I propose worship as the test given in the Sacred Scriptures, and by able men who have written on this subject, and have attempted to show the reasonableness of this test, from the theory of worship given by both Drs. Medhurst and Legge.

In answer to this, our opponents point to the Romanists, who worship saints and angels, the Virgin Mary, &c., and say that as they are not polytheists, so the Chinese, though they worship great numbers of *shin*, may not be polytheists either. This objection is worthy of consideration. The worship of any other being than the self-existent God is false worship, is idolatry; but all idolatry is not necessarily polytheism. What makes the distinction? The answer is, the worship of these objects under the same name with God, thus ranking them in the *same class* of beings with him. The Romanists we know, not only never worship any saint or angel, calling them gods, but they make a distinction also (a vain one as I think) between the worship given to God, and to the Virgin and the saints. But the Chinese in the worship of their Shángtí (who, it is now maintained, is the true God) and their shin, make no such distinction. They have no absolute name

of a *higher class of beings* for him; they call him merely the *chief*, the *most honorable* of the *shin*, and worship, along with him, all their *shin* under this *common name*. When in the Chau Lí, we read that an officer, "the Tsung Peh," was appointed to worship the national *Shin*, *K'i*, *Kwei*, &c., we find Shángtí the first enumerated *shin* on the list of those sacrificed to. When, in the same work, we read of the Great Chaplain, we find that this officer's duty was to superintend the offering up of the six forms of prayer to the *shin* (the celestial gods), the *k'i* (the terrestrial gods), and the *kwei* (the man-derived—the manes). Of these six forms of prayer generally, thus offered to these beings, the commentators say, they "were used at the *kiáu* when they sacrificed to Heaven *(Shángtí)* and Earth, and to the gods *(shin)* of the land and grain, and at the sacrifices offered in the ancestral temple." Of the second prayer, the "*nien chuh*," that it "was used to pray to *Shángti* and the gods *(shin)* of the land and grain for the bestowal of grain." So it is everywhere; Shángtí is *worshiped* as a *shin*, there is no special officer appointed for his worship; he is merely honored as the *chief* of the *Shin*. Now suppose that the Romanists were to worship Jehovah and the Virgin Mary, the Apostles and angels, all under one *common name*; would they not be polytheists? When we find Hau-t'ien Shángtí, the chief object of worship among the Confucianists, and Yuh-hwáng Shángtí, the chief object of worship among the Táuists (which are the two native indigenous religions of China), both called *shin*, and *worshiped* as shin; and that all the other beings worshiped in the national rites, or by the Táuists, are called *shin*, and *worshiped* as shin; we contend that if Hau-t'ien Shángtí is a god, and Yuh-hwáng-tí Shángtí is a god, then, if the Chinese have any gods at all, and any name by which they call them, these gods are their *shin*; and that this word *Shin* is the appellative name of these gods.

But, says Dr. Medhurst, Shángtí we admit is a spiritual being, and *shin* in these cases means spirit. Let us test this by a parallel case, and see if the word *spirit* could maintain its meaning if used as *shin* is. "There are six celestial spirits. Jehovah, who is worshiped in the temple on Mount Zion, is the first." "Jehovah is the spirit of heaven." "Jehovah is the most honorable of all the spirits." "The greatest of the spirits of heaven is called Jehovah." "The *Spirit* of heaven is most honorable, and (a Being) with whom *none* can be compared." "There is not a *spirit* we have not honored. But *Michael* is not able, and *Jehovah* does not come down to our relief." Would not this way of speaking either bring down Jehovah God—the Supreme Being—

to the rank of spirits, or carry up the spirits so spoken of, to the rank of Jehovah, and if He be God, make them Gods too?

Again, let us suppose that we learned from the Sacred Scriptures, that Jehovah had been worshiped under the *name* of, and as a spirit; that throughout the whole ritual directing the worship conducted on Mount Zion, He was regarded as a spirit; that we should observe, that, according to this ritual, "the principal object of the ceremonies (there used) was to serve the *spirits*," and that among all the ceremonies employed, "those that were used in the service of *the spirits* were considered *most important;* that the officers appointed were "to sacrifice to, and offer up prayers to the *spirits*," and that there was not any passage in the whole ritual which spoke of any priest appointed to sacrifice to or worship Him under the name of, or as, God; should we not think that the words *God* and *Spirit* had changed places?

Now this is the case in China. *Shin* is the highest *absolute appellative noun* in the language; there is no class of beings higher than this class; Shángtí, the Supreme Ruler, the highest being spoken of in the Classics, is merely the *chief one* of this *class*. No officers were ever appointed to worship any class of beings called *ti*, rulers. Shángtí, the Supreme Ruler, was worshiped, but, as we have seen, *as a shin*, the Ruler of the *other shin*, and not as a being of a distinct class, or species from the shin over whom he ruled, as he must have been, if the Chinese regarded him as a god, and the other shin as *mere spirits*, beings belonging to a *different species*. More than this, we are expressly told, that "if Shángtí were not a shin (observe he might still be a *ti*, a ruler; or a *Sháugti*, a Supreme Ruler), it would be of no use to pray to him; but if he be a *shin*, he can not be deceived." Here Shángtí's being a proper object of *worship* is ascribed to the fact of his being *a shin*, (not to his being *ti*, or *Shángtí)*, and it is in consequence of his being a *shin*, that he knows the thoughts and purposes of the human heart, so that he can not be deceived by an insincere worshiper. If *shin* means nothing more than spirit, and Shángtí is the highest being known to the Chinese, deriving as he does his right to *worship* and his *heart-discerning intelligence* from his being a *shin* (the word which denotes his *nature*), and not from his being Shángtí, the Supreme Ruler over the other shin,—his *official title)*, then it seems clear that the Chinese can not know of any higher being, or class of beings, than spirits, and it is of no use to seek for any word in their language meaning a god, gods, not to mention for an instant, a word answering to our word God.

From these considerations it is quite conclusive to my mind that the Chinese, because of the worship of their *shin* are to be accounted polytheists, and not polypneumatists.

But the Chinese are acquainted not only with the objects worshiped in their two indigenous religions, viz. Confucianism and Táuism; they have encountered men of other religions, and in their books have given us an account of the objects worshiped by these foreigners. By what Chinese name then do the Confucianists and Táuists call the beings whom these foreigners call gods?

The answer to this question will assist us much in determining what is the appellative name for *God* in Chinese. For instance, if it is maintained that Heaven and Earth, and the beings who preside over the land and grain, over wealth, fire, &c., when worshiped under the *common name shin*, are *all* worshiped as mere spirits and not gods; there can be no doubt of the light in which Budha is regarded; no one would think of calling him a mere spirit. What then do the Confucianists call him?

In the historical work called Káng Kien Í Chí 綱鑑易知, or Mirror of History, when describing the introduction of Budhism into China, the author says, "The king heard that in the West 有神其名曰佛, there was a god *(shin)* whose name was Budha." The historian quoted in Kánghí's Dictionary under the character *fuh* 佛, tells a story of the Emperor Ming 明 of the Hán dynasty (A.D. 50), seeing in a dream a golden man flying about his palace. The next morning, upon inquiring the meaning of it he was told by one of his courtiers that it related to Budha. His words were 天竺國有佛卽神也, "In India there is Budha, that is a god *(shin)*." In the Commentary on the Sacred Edict, he is repeatedly called "*Shin Fuh* 神佛, the god Budha." The word *shin* in all these instances must be rendered *god* and not *spirit;* if then when speaking of a foreign object of worship, who is confessedly not a mere spirit but a god, they call him *shin*, why should not we suppose that when they call their native objects of worship, Heaven, Earth, &c., &c., *shin*, they mean to rank them as *gods* also, and not as mere spirits?

We have also accounts of other foreign religions besides that of the Budhists. In a work on geography recently published by Sü Sung-lung, the lieut.-governor of Fuhkien province, the author speaks much of the religions of the people he describes. Speaking of the Persians and Indians, he says, "In the high antiquity, in Persia and India, all served the God of Fire *(Ho Shin* 火神). Those who served the

god of Fire worshiped the rising sun, or igniting faggots, they worshiped towards them. For the people considered that if there was no fire wherewith to cook, they could not live; and that if there was no bright sun, then in the universe there could be nothing seen. Therefore the foreigners of these two countries, from a high antiquity, had this custom. The idea arose from a desire to recompense the root (*i.e.* to acknowledge their god, the sun, as a source of blessing): it was not a depraved god" *(sié shin) i.e.* a being who afflicted them with curses, but a benignant being who sent them blessings. Now the Sun is the one being worshiped by the Parsees. Do they regard this being as a mere spirit? Could this author have supposed they regarded *it* as a mere spirit? Speaking of the ruin of Ormuz, our author says "There is an old temple there where the sun, the god of Fire *(Ho Shin)* was honored." "The Africans," he tells us, "worship trees, birds, and beasts as gods *(shin)*, and whoever kills an enemy offers him in sacrifice to them.....The people of Guinea worship birds and beasts as gods *(shin)*." When telling of Hannibal's swearing eternal enmity to the Romans, he says that he swore before 入必德爾. *Jih-pih-tih-'rh*, Jupiter, and in a note calls him "*so fung tsung tsú chí shin* 所奉宗祖之神, the god *(shin)* whom their ancestors worshiped." Thus we see that the word *shin* is used by this writer just as we would use the word *god* in English. No one would say the Parsees worshiped "the Sun, the spirit of fire;" that Jupiter was a spirit; that trees, birds, beasts, &c., were worshiped as spirits.

But there are nations with whose worship we are yet more familiar, whose religion is spoken of by this writer. In the 3d Section, 37th page of his work, he speaks of the object worshiped by the Jews and by all the European nations. By what name does he call this Being? His account is as follows:—"In Fuh-lin (Palestine) *i.e.* in Judea and in the countries to the west of it (Europe), all serve the God (*Shin*) of heaven. The worship of the God (*Shin*) of heaven commenced with Moses in the time of *Wuh-ting* (B.C. 1720) in the beginning of the Shâng dynasty. He (Moses) pretends that the God *(Shin)* of heaven descended upon Mount Sinai in Arabia, and delivered the Ten Commandments for the instruction of men. The observance of the seventh day as a Sabbath commenced from this time, which is distant from the birth of Jesus one thousand and several hundred years. The *(t'ien chú kiáu)* religion of the Lord of Heaven (the Romish) sprung from this; it is not the Romish religion."

Of the character of the Being worshiped by the Jews and Europeans, *we* can have no question; and I think there can be no doubt

that this author knew that He who gave the law at Mount Sinai, and who is the alone object of worship of the Jews, the Romanists, and of all Europeans, was no mere spirit; and yet he calls Him all through this section the *Shin* of heaven. In other parts he calls Jesus, when spoken of as an object of worship, by this name *Shin*: *e. g.* the 6th Section, at the 39th page:—"Those who enter the religion of Jesus, do not sacrifice to any other god *(Shin)* 不祀別神, they do not make offerings to their ancestors, but regard Jesus as the Savior of the world." Also Section 2, p. 7., 不祀先祖所奉之神, 惟吠氏而已, "they do not sacrifice to ancestors but *Luh-shi* (Logos!); that is, Jesus is the only god *(Shin)* they serve."

These quotations from the work of the lieut.-governor of Fuhkien, who is admitted to be a very accomplished writer, are of importance, not only to prove that the word *Shin* is, in some cases at any rate, used in the sense of god and not spirit; they are also very important to rebut some assertions of Dr. Medhurst contained in his recent publications.

In the Letter to the Protestant Missionaries at the Five Ports, signed by himself and five others, he asserts that the use of *shin* to render Θεος in the N. T. would render "the whole work unclássical and contemptible," "provoke the ridicule of every well informed Chinese;" that "it would spoil the work for any efficiency to others;" "produce monstrous difficulties for us to struggle against," "involve an absurdity;" and above all, "throw obstacles in the way of the reception of the truth on the part of the Chinese."

That, under all the circumstances of the case, Dr. M. and his friends, to carry a particular point should have had recourse to such rhetoric as that above quoted, is very much to be regretted. Dr. Medhurst has been for thirty years a student of the Chinese language; he is known to be an excellent scholar, and he might justly expect that his opinions on any matter respecting the Chinese would have great weight, not only in Europe and America, but also with his missionary brethren in China, especially those recently arrived. This should have bound him to particular carefulness in the statements of the facts of this great case which he put forth to the public, and to the exercise of much caution in the expression of his opinions. Instead of this, his statements concerning the facts of the case have been so contradictory (no notice being given to the reader of these contradictions), and many of the opinions expressed by him are so manifestly the result of irritation, not of calm judgment, that we must warn him not to be surprized if, in China at least, and among his missionary brethren,

whose knowledge of the language of the country enables them to inquire for themselves of "well-informed Chinese," what is their opinion of the use of *Shin*, if his statements and opinions cease to have any weight at all.

On Dr. Medhurst's contradictory statements with respect to the meaning and character of some of the most important words about which controversy exists, I have already commented, and shall have still further occasion to comment; so that I shall say nothing more on that subject at present. But I will here mention some of the circumstances connected with the Letter of the 30th Jan., which tend, in my mind, to deprive the opinions therein expressed in the intemperate language above quoted, of all weight.

On the 17th of January, Dr. Medhurst, Mr. Stronach and Mr. Milne urged Dr. Bridgman and myself to consent to a compromise of our difficulties, in order to procure an immediate edition of parts of the N. T. The compromise proposed by them was that we should consent to their having 5,000 copies with the word Θεος rendered by 𥘅, on which condition they would consent to our having 5,000 copies with Θεος rendered by *Shin*. This compromise we rejected: this was on the 17th of January, 1850.

These facts are important, as the sequel will show, to enable the reader to estimate, at their true worth, the opinions of Dr. M. and of Messrs. S. and M. above quoted. On the 17th of January, they surely could not have supposed that the use of *Shin* to translate Θεος would render God's holy word "contemptible," and "throw obstacles in the way of the reception of the truth on the part of the Chinese," or, they could not have consented to a compromise with such a term; and if they learned, at so late a stage of our controversy, all these sad things about *Shin*, only after they became provoked with us for rejecting their proffered compromise, *i.e.* between the 17th and 30th of January, the judicious reader will readily understand how much, opinions taken up under such circumstances, and expressed in such language, should weigh with him.

If the opinions concerning *Shin* above quoted are correct, no missionary, as he reverences God's holy word, should have anything to do with it as the rendering of Θεος; and if every "well-informed Chinese" is to be supposed capable of appreciating the "ridicule" its use must cause, all those who have used this term for God are to be esteemed shamefully culpable for not exercising even the commonest care in a matter of such extreme importance. I am far from desiring that the cause of *Shin* should stand upon the shoulders of any men; if it is not

sustained by truth and right reason, let it fall, and the sooner the better; but I am unwilling that all who have used it should be accounted guilty of rendering God's holy word "contemptible." It is well known that Drs. Morrison, Milne, and Marshman used this word *Shin* as the rendering of *Elohim* and Θεος in their versions of the SS.; and one would have supposed that this fact would have restrained all of the six signers from speaking in such language of the use of *Shin* for God in the Scriptures. But in the case of Dr. Medhurst, in addition to his respect for the dead and the living who have used this word, we should have supposed that some regard for his own past course would have prevented his asserting, so broadly and unqualifiedly, that such a use of *Shin* would render God's holy word contemptible.

I have before me a copy of a work of his on the Ten Commandments. The First reads thus:—"*Shin* spake all these words, saying, I am the Divine Lord (*Shin Chú* 神主) thy *Shin*," &c. The object of the First Commandment is thus stated, 論只拜一神. "Teaches that we should only worship one *Shin*." Had Dr. Medhurst never met with a "well-informed Chinese," when he wrote this work, whose opinion he might have asked, and so prevented himself from rendering that important part of God's holy word "contemptible," which I am sure the object of his work was to commend to the reverence and obedience of the Chinese? In the *Sán-sz' King*, Dr. M. uses the word *Shin* for God throughout. Such sentences as the following occur: 神爲靈. God (*Shin*) is a Spirit (*Ling*); 萬人乎頌讚神. O, all ye people, praise *Shin*; 神造人, *Shin* (God) made man; 神之子. God's (*Shin*) Son, &c., &c. This work has been distributed by members of the mission who signed this Letter, since the passages quoted from it were published. How can Dr. Medhurst and the other signers of this Letter account for their conduct in thus distributing this book, if they *really believe* that the use of Shin for God renders a work "contemptible," and that the calling God by this name will "provoke the ridicule of *every* well-informed Chinese?" And if they were not so fully persuaded of this as to allow it to influence their own conduct, how could they publish such opinions to influence the conduct of others?

When I read this letter, I could not but ask myself, Do these six signers really suppose that Drs. Morrison, Milne and Marshman, never met with any well-informed Chinese; or, meeting with them, never put themselves to the trouble to inquire what they thought of the use of *Shin* to render the word *God*? Do they really mean to assert that the result of the many years of hard labor of these zealous

men was to make God's holy book "contemptible" in the eyes of the Chinese, and to bring upon themselves and their work the ridicule of this heathen nation? Are Dr. Medhurst and those who signed this paper with him, the only missionaries now in China who are favored with the intercourse of well-informed Chinese? Dr. Medhurst, from his whole course seems determinded either to destroy *Shin*, or his own reputation for accuracy. *Shin*, I am persuaded, is beyond his reach.

I will not dwell longer on this unpleasant subject; but we surely could not have more direct proof that *Shin* may be used for God, without giving offense to "well-informed Chinese," than that furnished in the quotations above given from the geographical work, unless the intelligence of this high dignitary is to be impeached.*

There is another consideration which proves conclusively to my mind that the *shin* are, in the estimation of the Chinese, gods, not spirits. It is that they call their idols by this name. The Chinese are, like the Athenians, "wholly given to idolatry." To their idols they have built thousands of temples: every street, every house, even their boats are full of them: so that Dr. Medhurst, in his work on this country, tells us, "that it was more easy to find a god than a man in China." These idols, whether done in stone or wood, or drawn on paper, are called by the people *shin*. Of this fact any one, who can speak the language, may satisfy himself by going into their temples and inquiring of the bystanders where the *Shin* thereof, *e.g.* of Fire,

* My object in quoting from this writer is not to produce the impression upon the mind of the reader, that according to his opinion the words *Elohim* and Θεος should, in our translation of the S. S., be rendered by *Shin*, or *Tien Shin* 天神 for I suppose the writer has never thought of the subject; but only to show that he does not hesitate to call the Being who gave the Law on Mount Sinai, the *Shin* of Heaven, and to call our blessed Savior "the only *Shin* worshiped by Christians." This author calls the Being worshiped by Christians, *Tien* 天, *Shang Tien* 上天 *Shang Ti* 上帝, *Tien Chú* 天主, *Tien Shin* 天神, and *Shin* 神. Thus his authority may be quoted for rendering this word, when used propriè, by any of these phrases; but it should be observed he does not call the Sun worshiped by the Parsees, the trees, beasts, and birds worshiped by the people of Africa, or the Jupiter of the Greeks *Tien* or *Shangti*, but *Shin*. If then we would choose a word that can be employed to render *Elohim* and Θεος, both when used propriè and impropriè, and will be guided by this author, we must use *Shin;* for it was a *Shin* who give the law at Mount Sinai; it is Jesus who is the alone *Shin* worshiped by Christians; and the objects worshiped by Greeks, Parsees, and Africans are *Shin* and not *Shangti*.—For an interesting account of some old temples that were built in the Xth century to the God of Heaven, see Appendix B.

and inquiring of the bystanders where the *Shin* thereof, *e. g.* of Fire, Wealth, &c, is. Dr. Bettelheim gives us the following letter from an officer of Lewchew about the gods of a temple in that country:—

"I yesterday received your letter. You went to see the *Hú-kwoh* (Country-protecting) Monastery, and found it in all respects commodious and suitable for a residence. You do not speak now of removing to another lodging, but you request us to remove the gods *(shin)* of the temple, and place them outside of it. But the abbot of this monastery has told me, in relation to removing these gods *(shin)*, that on his previous humble application you permitted them to remain as heretofore. Now this temple is the *place of prayer for the whole country*, and consequently of the *utmost importance*. In case you should remain long in it, there would be much inconvenience. I beg you to wait till another day, when I will choose a place, and let you know that you can move. I send this short note, respectfully hoping you are happy; this is all I have to say. Hiáng Yung-páu, treasurer of Chungshán fú. May 8th, 1846. An important communication." See *Jan. No., page* 31.

I have before me now a chart of all the *shin*, *(tsung shin* 總神). In the seat of highest eminence I see the representation of a venerable old man with a crown on his head; directly over him are written the two characters *Shángti* 上帝; it is the chief god of the Táuists; there are *shin* of all ranks and sizes around him; Confucius, too, is there; the *Wú Ti* 五帝 Five Rulers are there also; every one of these *shin* is represented as a corporeal being, has a human figure; and yet Dr. Medhurst now tells us the Chinese *Shin* are not gods, but mere spirits. What! you ask: That old man who sits at the head of them all—this stone or wooden thing—do the Chinese really think it a spirit; an incorporeal, immaterial being? To this, Dr. M. replies: "The phrase 'wooden gods' may occur, but it is evident it is used by metonomy for the wooden *images* of gods; and it would be quite as appropriate to speak of the *wooden images* of spirits, or of saints, as of gods." The propriety of such a figure of speech will depend upon the character of the gods of whom these wooden statues are said to be images. A spirit is, if we understand the word aright, *ex vi termini*, an immaterial, incorporeal being. A material image of such a being is very different from that of a god, who may be supposed to be a being compounded of spirit and body. The Apostle says in Rom. i. 21, "Their foolish heart was darkened; they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds," &c., *i.e.* they lost the sense of God's pure spirituality, and conceived of him as resembling men, birds, beasts, &c.

The Greeks we know made images of their θεοι, and all polytheists we believe have done the same: but these makers of images we fancy

have never regarded their gods as purely spiritual,—incorporeal, immaterial beings. Spiritual beings they were, but not uncompounded: they had bodies as well as spirits, so that there was no absurdity in their making corporeal images of them. If the Greeks esteemed their gods as pure spirits, how could Demetrius have any controversy with Paul for asserting that "They be no gods that are made with hands." The gods of Homer are certainly corporeal beings—not mere immaterial spirits. They ride in chariots, fight in armor, and are wounded in conflict with mortal men; *e. g.* when Minerva mounted the car as the charioteer of Diomed,

> "The groaning axle bent beneath *the load*,
> So great a Hero, and so great a God."

Diomed and Mars fight: the poet thus describes their encounter:—

> "Now, rushing fierce, *in equal arms appear*,
> The daring Greek, the dreadful god of War.
> Full at the chief, above his courser's head,
> From Mars's *arm* th' enormous weapon fled:
> Pallas opposed *her hand*, and caused to glance
> Far from the car, the strong immortal lance;
> Then threw the force of Tideus' warlike son;
> The javelin hiss'd; the goddess urged it on;
> Where the *broad cincture girt his armor round*
> It *pierced the God*; his *groin* received the wound.
> Mars *bellows with the pain*, &c."*

To speak of the images of such gods as these appears natural and appropriate; but I can not see what propriety there would be in persons making "wooden images of spirits,"—of incorporeal, immaterial beings. Until therefore Dr. M. brings us an instance of some people making stone or wooden images, and worshiping them under the name of *spirits*, we must conclude from the fact that the Chinese make images of their *shin* and worship them, that they do regard them as gods; and that, because of this worship, they are to be accounted polytheists, and not polypneumatists.

In answer to all that we have urged above to show that *shin* is the absolute, appellative name of the Chinese gods, instances are produced in which the word can not be rendered *god;* where, for instance, the human spirit—that of a living man—is called *shin;* and as the word in this case can not be rendered a *god*, the inference is drawn that it can not in any instance have this meaning. Dr. L. says, "If it

* According to the views of the American Missionary, Homer here seems to use the word Θεος very unclassically; but if the Iliad is to be put aside, what Greek book shall we consider entitled to rank among the Greek classics?

really mean *god* in any case, then it always means god." But words are not so bound down to a single meaning as Dr. L. would here have us to suppose; and in this particular case, the absurdity of supposing that different Chinese writers, or even the same Chinese writer, may have used the same word for both *god* and *spirit*, is not manifest to my mind. I know that Drs. Morrison, Milne, Medhurst, Gutzlaff, and a number of other very intelligent Christian men have used *shin* in the sense of *God, a god, gods*, and of *spirit* also; and if such men as these have fallen into the error of using the same word for God and spirit, it is surely too much to suppose it an absurdity to fancy that Chinese writers may have used the word *shin* in the sense of *a god, gods*, and in that of *spirit* also. I readily admit that to render *shin god*, in the cases adduced by Dr. L.,—"I felt my heart and god *(shin)* blown about;" and, "As I write, my god *(shin)* gallops away to you &c.;"—would be very absurd; for there can be no doubt that by *sin shin* 心神 in the first sentence, and *shin* 神 in the last, the writer means his own mind.

But on the contrary, I contend that the absurdity is equally great to suppose the writers quoted above use the word *Shin* in *this sense*, when they call the Being who gave the Law on Mount Sinai a *Shin*; when they call Jesus the only *Shin* worshiped by Christians; or Budha, the *Shin Fuh*; or say trees, birds, and beasts were worshiped as *shin*. When both classes of facts are considered, the conclusion to my mind is inevitable, that the Chinese use this word *shin* where we would use *god* and also *spirit*. I contend, however, that when used in the place of the latter word, they do not attach the same meaning to the word *shin* that we do to the word *spirit*. With us, the word *spirit* means a created, incorporeal, intelligent being: the human spirit we regard as such a being. The Chinese, I fancy, do not call the human spirit *shin* from conceiving of it in this way; but on the contrary, from regarding it as a part of the eternally existing *Shin* that belonged to the primordial substance of which heaven, earth, man, and all things were made. The human *shin*, therefore, is only a portion of the universally diffused divinity. But I shall endeavor to set forth the Chinese views of this matter more fully after I have noticed Dr. Medhurst's answer to the conclusion drawn from the premises stated in my Essay, viz., "That the class of beings called *shin*, being the highest class worshiped by the Chinese, must be regarded as the gods of China, and *shin* as the generic name for *god* in the Chinese language." "In reply to this," Dr. M. says (See Vol. XVII., page 552), "we may observe that we have abundantly proved *shin* to be the general

name for spirits in the Chinese language, including a larger range of beings than what are usually termed *gods* in any country, while it is never used for *God*, par excellence, by any Chinese writer." This reply only brings out the necessity, above insisted on, of some *characteristic test* by which to distinguish between gods and spirits. To say the *shin* include "a larger range of beings than what are usually termed gods," is so vague that we can determine nothing from it, as the Chinese may have used the appellative name for *god* in their language to include a larger range of beings than any other people have ever done.

With respect to the next point, on which Dr. M. evidently lays the greatest stress, that as *shin* is never used for *God* par excellence, therefore it can not be the generic name for *god* in Chinese, it appears to me a complete *non sequitur*. It is in effect contending that, because an appellative noun has never been used to designate by way of eminence a certain one of the class of which it is the general name, *ergo*, it can not be the generic name of that class. The questions, I contend, are perfectly distinct. Is *shin* the generic or absolute appellative name of the Chinese gods? And, has this word ever been used to designate by way of eminence the chief one of the class; the highest being they have ever conceived of? It can serve no purpose but to entangle the argument to merge these questions into one.

We say the class called *gods* is the highest class of beings acknowledged by polytheists, therefore the word *god* is the highest absolute appellative noun in the language of said polytheists: in accordance with this we show that *shin* is the highest absolute appellative noun in the Chinese language; in other words, it is the absolute name of the highest class of beings known to the Chinese, and we conclude that this word must either be the name of their gods, or that they have no gods. We show that *Shángti* is merely the chief one of this class; that he is worshiped as one of this class, and that it is said it would be no use to worship him if he did not belong to this class; but, because it has not pleased the Chinese to use the general name of this class when standing absolutely to designate the highest being they know, but choose to call him either by his proper name 天 *Tien*, Heaven, or by his title *Shángti* 上帝 the Supreme Ruler, or the Ruler on high, Dr. M. contends that *shin* can not be the generic name for *god* in Chinese. As well might he contend that the word *jin* 人 is not the name of the genus *homo* in Chinese, because the chief one of this genus, he who has most power, to whom the most honor and reverence is shown, and whom all the other individuals of

this genus in China obey, is never called "the man" par excellence, but is distinguished either by his proper name, or by some title.*

To upset the conclusion that *shiu* is the absolute appellative name for *god* in Chinese, it should be shown who the Chinese gods are; that they are a higher class of beings than the *shin*, and what their absolute appellative name is; this last word being found, the claim of *shin* would be set aside at once. Dr. Medhurst wrote his Inquiry to prove that *ti* 帝 was this word, the "generic for God in Chinese." This ground, however, he abandoned in his letter of the 30th January, 1850, and it has since been most peremptorily overruled by Dr. Legge, who says, "The question 'what is the generic term for god in Chinese' is futile, as there is no such word in any language. It *(ti)* means Ruler." According to Dr. Legge, *god* is a relative term; he goes therefore in quest of an appellative relative, and finds all he wants in *Shángti;* this, however, can not content Dr. M., who must have a generic term, and who all through his writings has regarded the word *god* as an absolute appellative. Having fallen out with *shin*, and being obliged to abandon *ti* as this absolute appellative, there was no resource left him but to fly to a foreign language for aid. According to his principles, and that of those who signed with him the letter of the 30th January, that we must have a generic term, he should I think, have returned to *shin*, and adhered to this term, until some higher absolute appellative noun in the language was produced, or he became convinced that the Chinese have no gods at all; for the fact that *shin* is never used when standing absolutely to designate the chief Chinese god, can not prove that it is not the general name of all their gods. If the fact could be *proved*, which it is the object of this argument to *imply*, that because Shángtí, the chief god, is never designated by *shin* when this word stands absolutely, he therefore belongs to a higher class of beings than the class called *shin; i. e.* that he is something more as to his *nature* than the chief *one* of this class, then indeed there would be great weight in the argument. Dr. M.'s Inquiry was written to make out this point, as I said, not only for Sháng-

* The argument of Dr. M., that, because *shin* is never used for God par excellence, it can not therefore be the generic name for *god* in Chinese, is based upon the assumption that the word for *god* in every language must first be used propriè, and then afterwards improprie, but I think I have sufficiently shown that this is bare assumption The first use of the appellative name for *god*, when standing absolutely, to designate a disposing mind, the author of all things, may be long subsequent to the use of this word as the general name of the gods of a people, as we have shown above in the instance of Anaxagoras, who is said first to have used the Greek word Θεος in this way.

tí, but for the other shin who are styled *ti*, rulers; but it is now admitted that *ti* is a relative term "that does not indicate nature," and the whole argument of the Inquiry of course goes for nothing. Dr. Legge asserts it as his opinion that "there are to the minds of the Chinese people three orders of intelligent existences—men, shin or spirits, and Shángtí." If Dr. Legge had proved this instead of merely asserting it; if he had shown that the authors quoted by me in my Essay, who assert "That Shángtí is the Shin of Heaven;" "the greatest of the celestial Shin;" "the most honorable of the hundred Shin," &c., &c., were mistaken, and had degraded him by such a classification; and above all, that he was never *worshiped among this class*, and under the *name of shin;* it would have had more weight than such a naked assertion, without any attempt at proof; for I can not consider the assertion that "Shángtí is the Lord and Governor of the other two," as affording the slightest *proof* that the *nature* of Shángtí is higher than that of the shin he governs. If this be admitted as proof of superiority of *nature*, then I am sure, quite as good an argument can be constructed to prove that the Emperor, who is styled *Hwángti* 皇帝 August Ruler, is of a higher nature than the men over whom he rules.

That *shin* has never been used, when standing absolutely, to designate the highest being known to the Chinese, has been, I believe, the greatest hindrance to its universal adoption as the rendering of *Elohim* and Θεος by the Protestant missionaries now in China. Under all the circumstances of the case however, I fancy, that this word is better adapted to our purpose, which is, to teach this people the knowledge of the true God, not having been thus applied, than it would have been, if by previous Chinese usage, it had designated, when standing absolutely, their highest being, their chief god *T'ien*. This *T'ien* not being like the monadic Θεος of the Greeks αγενεηλος; not being the maker of the heavens and the earth; not a self-existent, independent being, who can be regarded as truly and properly God; had the word *Shin*, when standing absolutely, designated this being, we should have had to unteach them this meaning of the word, and to have taught them to understand by it when so used, not their *t'ien*, but Jehovah, the self-existent, the living and true God. Instead of an assistance, such a use of the word καθ' ἐξοχὴν would have been a hindrance to us. Being the absolute appellative name of *god* in Chinese, we should have been obliged to use this word; and its having already been employed, when standing absolutely to designate a false god, we should have had the double work, first to unteach, and next

to teach. If therefore seems to me that, as among all the Chinese gods there is not one who is self-existent, not one who is truly and properly God, we may rejoice that the general name of their gods was never used to designate any one of them as Shin καθ' ἐξοχήν; this use of the term, when put absolutely to designate a definite individual being, being reserved by God's providence, for his own servants to introduce, as the absolute appellative name of Himself, who alone can claim to be the God by way of eminence, the alone God.

Shin never having been used to designate any definite individual, the indefiniteness of this term has been felt by many as a great difficulty in the way of its use to render *Elohim*. That the word is thus indefinite there can be no doubt, and that our being obliged to use so indefinite a word to render *Elohim* is a matter much to be regretted, is clear; but this is not so much an objection against *shin*, as against the whole Chinese language, and is, if the Chinese really know no being who is truly and properly God, just what we might have expected; for without a clear apprehension, that among the beings called by the "one general name, answering to that of God among us," (to use the words of Dr. Barrow quoted above p. 575) there was *one*, who himself uncreated and self-existent, was the author of all the rest, and of all things beside, we could not expect that this general name would have been used to designate any καθ' ἐξοχήν, for such a use has a monotheistic force about it, and gives an absolute eminence to this one, which nothing but his being the cause of all the others would, we may suppose, suggest, or seem to justify.

In the Confucian classics their chief god *T'ien* is never so conceived of; he is never supposed to have made *ti* 地 earth, or any of the *t'ien shin* 天神 celestial gods. He is, as we have so often said above, merely the chief of his class, and is therefore more appropriately distinguished from the other *shin* by a title of office or dignity, than he would be by a καθ' ἐξοχήν use of the general name of the class *(shin)*, just as in the case of the chief among the men in China, who is in like manner distinguished from his fellowmen by a title of office or dignity, and not by the καθ' ἐξοχήν use of the word *jin* 人 man: the only difference being, that whereas Yáu or Shun is simply *Ti Yáu*, the Emperor Yáu, or *Ti Shun*, the Emperor Shun, and their remarks are introduced by the phrase *Ti yueh* 帝曰 the Emperor said: *T'ien* is called *Shángti*, the Ruler or Emperor on high, and he is so impersonal a being in their conceptions, that I do not remember a single sentence in which the phrase "*Shángti yueh* 上帝曰, the Ruler on high says," occurs.

If we compare the Chinese views on the subject of deity with the views which Dr. Barrow has given as first, those which have "been a constant opinion in all place and times;" and secondly, those which have been "the general sense of the most ancient, most wise, and most noble nations among men," we shall find that the Chinese agree in every particular with the first class, but have never attained to the second. *E. g.* they have believed, to use Dr. Barrow's words, "that in the world, there are beings imperceptible to our senses, much superior to us in knowledge and power, that can perform works above and contrary to the cause of nature, and who concerning themselves sometimes to do so for the interest of mankind; for these qualifications and performances deserve extraordinary respect from us;" and they have to this "sort of beings given one general name" *(shin)* "as hath been in all languages assigned, answering to that of *god* among us." But they have never gone on to the second class described by Barrow; they never believed that "of such beings there is *one*, supreme and most excellent, incomparably surpassing in all those attributes of wisdom, and power, and goodness, from whom *the rest* and *all things beside*, have *derived their* beings, do *depend upon*, are sustained and governed by; the author of *all being*, and dispenser of *all good*, to whom consequently supreme love, reverence, and obedience, is due;" and in consequence of this they have not, as "the wisest and noblest nations among men have done," appointed "this general name" *(God* or *shin)* "in a peculiar and eminent manner to *this one*, so that when the word is absolutely put, without any adjunct of limitation or diminution, he only is meant and understood." This is the plain fact of the case, the Chinese have not used the absolute appellative name of their gods, as Barrow says the noblest nations of men have done; the reason I have supposed is, that their highest being wanted the essential characteristics (self-existence and omni-causality, as Cudworth calls them) of the highest being of these noblest nations.

But however it may be accounted for, the fact is undoubtedly so, and the question is, What are we, under the actual circumstances of the case, to do? How are we to teach the Chinese the knowledge of such a being, and to lead them on even beyond this, to monotheism. I answer, follow the example of these noblest nations; use "the general name of this sort of beings, without any adjunct of limitation or diminution, when absolutely put," to designate, not their highest being, but ours—to designate Jehovah, the true Shin. By this course we shall teach an unmistakable monotheism; the general name of their gods is challenged as proper to Jehovah alone; the other *shin* are all

pushed *out of existence*, they are made to be no *shin*—nonentities. A new distinction is introduced as existing between the members of the class comprehended under this common name, in place of the old polytheistic one of higher and lower, ruler and ruled—a distinction of true and false—a distinction founded on nature, according to the words of the Apostle in Gal. iv. 8., "Then when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by *nature* are no gods."

Dr. Legge proposes to effect this object by the use of a title of dignity or office, by the use of the phrase *Shangti*, the Supreme Ruler. But with this phrase, I am persuaded, he will never teach the Chinese a real monotheism. He may teach a Divine Monarchy, but this, so far from being monotheism, implies, in all the polytheistic systems with which we are acquainted, a plurality—a large class of gods, as the subjects of this Divine Monarch.

The affirmation that "there is only one *Shángti*" will never teach monotheism. The assertion "that there is only one Supreme Ruler" does not push the gods now worshiped by the Chinese out of existence; it does not introduce the scriptural distinction of true God, or no God at all, but only continues the old polytheistic distinction of supreme and inferior, recognized here in China from the days of Yáu and Shun to the present time, and which *ex vi termini*, instead of negativing, implies the existence of the inferior equally with that of the superior. No title of office or dignity will answer, no word limited "by adjunct" or adjective can be used to declare that there is in reality *only one of the species* spoken of; and therefore it is, that we *must use* the absolute appellative name of the gods of a polytheistic people to render *Elohim* and Θεος into their language. The fact that *shin* has never been used κατ' ἐξοχήν to designate their *T'ien*, should not induce us to lay this word aside for the name of a dignity or office, but only be remembered by us as indicating how much we have to teach this poor, benighted nation.

That people have fallen into errors on any given subject is no reason why we should not call this subject by the same name they do, when our object is to correct these errors.

There are two uses of the word *Shin* that have weighed very much against its employment as the rendering of *Elohim* and Θεος: I refer to the fact that the manes of the dead, and the human soul have been called by this name. When the circumstances that led to these uses are duly considered, it does not appear to me that either use is a valid objection to the employment of this word to render Θεος. I shall consider them separately.

And first that the calling the manes of ancestors in common with all the other objects worshiped, *shin*, is no argument to prove that the word when so used does not mean *god*, we think will appear from the following considerations:—1st. That the *distinctive* name of the manes of ancestors is *kwei*, not *shin*. 2d. That *shin* is the distinctive name of the objects of worship who reside in heaven (the Olympian deities). 3d. That, when not restricted to this, its appropriate meaning, it is then used as the general name of all the objects worshiped in the state religion. This appears from the explanation of the uses of this word quoted in Vol. XVII., p. 33:—"If we speak of them (*i. e.* the objects worshiped in the national rites) separately, the *t'ien shin*, celestial gods, are alone called *shin;* but if we speak of them collectively, then the *kwei*, human manes, and the *k'i*, terrestrial gods, are both called *shin*." That is, *Shin*, when thus used, is the general name of all the objects worshiped in the national rites. 4th. That the manes of a deceased ancestor, when regarded as an object of religious worship, should be ranked in the same class with the Chinese Olympian deities, so far as this is done, by their all being called by the same appellative name, *shin*, should not surprise us, when we remember the hero-gods of Greece and the "*Dii lares et penates*" of the Romans. That heroism was the idol of ancient Greece accounts to us for the fact that Hercules, after death, was ranked among the θεοι. If we remember that the whole ethical system of the Chinese turns, not on the duty of obedience to *T'ien* 天, to *Ti* 地, or to any other god, but on filial piety; with this fact on our minds, we shall have as little cause to wonder at the Chinese deification of a deceased ancestor, as at the Greek deification of a hero; find as little cause of surprize in the fact that *Hâu-tsih* (the ancestor) is classed with *Shângti*, among the *Shin* sacrificed to on the occasion of the great drought referred to on p. 46 of Vol. XVII., as that the Greeks called Ζευς, the father of gods and men, and Hercules (the hero), each a Θεος. 5th. *Elohim* being a name common alike to the true and to false gods, one of the most important uses of this word in the Sacred Scriptures is to forbid polytheism. It is indeed by its appellative character, and the consequent use that can be made of this word to forbid polytheism, that it is chiefly distinguished from the word "Jehovah;" and this is a point of the utmost importance for us to keep in mind, while discussing the rendering of this word into the language of a polytheistic people. Now it is an unquestionable fact that the false worship to which the Chinese are most addicted, and to which they are much the most attached, is that of their deceased ancestors. Should we not then rejoice, rather than

otherwise, that the word by which we must render *Elohim* (our great weapon against all false objects of worship), although it specially designates the Olympian gods, yet, by Chinese usage ready to our hand, has had its meaning so *extended* as to make the blow aimed at objects of false worship equally fatal to deceased ancestors and the terrestial *Ki*, as to the celestial gods themselves? As the Chinese are so inveterately addicted to the worship of their deceased ancestors, should we not be obliged to extend, by our explanations, the meaning of whatever word we use to render *Elohim* in the First Commandment, so as to include these manes? If this is so, surely it can not be an insuperable objection to the use of *Shin*, that the Chinese have preceded us in so *extending* its meaning.

The error of extending this name, the distinctive name of the celestial beings worshiped, to the terrestrial and man-derived, was a polytheistic error, one into which the Chinese polytheists naturally fell, for it is of the very nature of polytheism to go on from age to age increasing the number of its gods. The other error referred to above—that of calling the soul of a living man *Shin*, is of much more recent date I judge, from all I can learn; and has, I think, grown out of the pantheistic system of cosmogony taught in the *Yih King*.

As in the previous instance, so here, it is important to remember that the *original name* of the human soul in Chinese is *hwan* 魂 not *shin* 神. I have taken great pains to ascertain if the word *shin* occurs anywhere in the Five Classics, or in the Four Books, as the name of the soul of a living man, and have not been able to find an instance of such a use of the word. The calling the *hwan*, the human soul or mind of man *shin*, is said to have been introduced by the medical men. It appears to me to be a mere reversal of the process by which pantheism was conceived.

The Chinese philosophers, in endeavoring to form a scheme of the universe, regarded man as a microcosm, his constitution and nature formed their model. This model they conceived to consist of a body which had *hing* 形 form, and of a *hwan*, 魂 animus, and a *peh*, 魄 anima, which were invisible, and were regarded as the depositories of human life, intelligence, powers of locomotion, &c., &c. As we have seen (see p. 370), when discoursing of their cosmogony, the Confucian system of philosophy assumes the existence of two eternally-existing principles, *li* and *ki*. Of these, the philosophers of this sect affirm that *li* neither "wills nor wishes, plans nor makes;" but that "*ki* can collect together, make and do," "can ferment and settle, and generate things." The *ki*, primordial substance, is viewed under the two

aspects of *yin* and *yáng*; *i. e.* as passive or active. Of the *yin k'i*, or primordial substance which has vis inertiæ, they say *kwei* 鬼 is the *ling* 靈 spirit; and of the *yáng k'i*, or primordial substance which moves, or is active, *shin* 神 is the *ling* 靈 spirit. They also say that the *shin* is the *hwan* 魂 soul of the *yáng*, active principle; and that the *kwei* is the *peh* 魄 anima, of the *yin*, the passive principle. These last explanations of the *shin* and *kwei* throw much light upon the subject, and seem to point very clearly to the source from whence these philosophers borrowed the ideas on which their scheme of cosmogony was founded, viz., the *compound being man.*

Having thus conceived of a primordial substance possessed of a spirit or soul, and of an anima, like unto the microcosm man, they fancied they had now an agent suited to the work to be performed; and accordingly, to this compound primordial substance, so informed by *shin* and *kwei*,—this *yin yang chi k'i* 陰陽之氣—, is ascribed the making of the heavens and the earth and all things. *E. g.* "Heaven and earth are only a thing or creature of the *Yin* and *Yáng*; they are what the *yin*-ed and *yang*-ed *k'i* 陰陽之氣 (*i. e.* the primordial substance of which they predicate *Yin* and *Yáng*, passivity and activity) generated of old." See July No., *p.* 378, also *pp.* 368-370. Man's distinction above all other things arises not from his having an intelligent, moral, accountable, immortal spirit, unlike to that of the beasts which perish, and wholly different from anything possessed by the inanimate beings around him, but from his having been made from the finest parts or particles of this primordial substance. 惟人也得其秀而最靈, "but man, having obtained its most subtle or finest part, is most noble." All things being made from this one compound, primordial substance *k'i*, according to this system, it follows that Heaven, earth and man, and all things, are composed of the finer or grosser parts of this *k'i*, as to the material part of them; and that they also share one common *shin* and one common *kwei*, viz. the *kwei* and *shin* which are inherent parts of the eternally-existing, compound, primordial principle *k'i*. Hence we read, "The spirit of the great one above 太上 is the informing divinity or spirit *(Shin)* of the wide expanse; the spirit of Heaven and earth is the informing divinity or spirit *(Shin)* of the *Yin* and *Yáng*, the active and passive principles of the primordial substance; the spirit of men and beasts is the informing divinity or spirit *(Shin)* of flesh and blood: that in which they are the *same* is the possession of the same *Shin* divinity or spirit, (其同者神) but that in which they differ is (observe,

not *k'i* 氣 substance, but merely) *hing* 形 form." Quoted in the *Pei Wan Yun-fú* under the character *Shin*.

Chú fú-tsz' affirms that "the *human heart* is the same as the heart of *birds* and *beasts*, *grass* and *trees*." A commentator on the 16th Sect. of the *Chung Yung* says, "The *kwei* and *shin* of my own person (*wú shin chí kwei shin* 吾身之鬼神) are the *kwei* and *shin* who are the objects of sacrifice (*tsi sz' chi kwei shin* 祭祀之鬼神); and the *kwei* and *shin* who are the objects of sacrifice, are the *kwei* and *shin* of the mechanism of nature;" i. e. the *kwei* and *shin* who preside over the mechanism of nature.

Of this *Kwei* and *Shin*, Confucius, in the 16th Sect. of the *Chung Yung* affirms that, though invisible and inaudible, yet "they pervade, or are consubstantiated with (體物) all things, without a single exception. The critical commentator explains the phrase "pervade all things" as follows:—"*ti wuh* 體物 means *ti hú wuh* 體乎物 consubstantiated with things; but not that the things first existed and afterwards the *kwei* and *shin*; but that the *kwei* and *shin* first existed, and afterwards the things; and after the things had their existence, none of them could be divested of the *kwei* and *shin*. The *kwei* and *shin* are in the midst of things, and constitute (as it were) the bones of things. The *kwei* and *shin* are the hosts, and things are the guests. Between heaven and earth (*i. e.* in the universe) there only is this one *k'i* (compound ,primordial substance); that which enters into every atom and fibre (in the universe) is this *yin*-ed and *yáng*-ed *k'i*; and which envelopes heaven and earth as in a net, is this same *yin*-ed and *yáng*-ed *k'i*."

In the Commentary called the *Wáng Ta-chuen*, we have the following explanation:—"The *kwei* and *shin* are without form; therefore if you look at them, you can not see them: they are without sound; therefore, if you listen you can not hear them; but the production of things is never without [the presence of] the *k'i* 氣, the primordial substance; and this *k'i* (the *yáng*-ed *k'i*, or active principle is here meant) is the 盛 fulness of the *shin*, or is pervaded all through with *shin* (*i. e.* an inherent *ling* 靈 spirit or *hwan* 魂 soul). There is nothing [produced] without *peh* 魄; and this *peh* (the *yin*-ed *k'i*, or passive principle is here meant) is the fulness of the *kwei*, or is pervaded all through with *kwei* (*i. e.* an inherent *ling*, or *peh*), hence man is said to be a congregation of *kwei* and *shin* 鬼神之會."

These *kwei* and *shin* are made the authors of physical and moral effects; and also of the intellectual phenomena of the human mind.

Physical:—"all the *production* and *changes* of heaven and earth (*i. e.* that take place in the world), such as the flourishing and decaying of the blood and spirits of human life, the blooming and withering of plants and trees, with the *living and dying of all kinds of things*, are never without the *kwei* and *shin*, *i. e.* are invariably to be ascribed to the *kwei* and *shin*." Critical Commentary on 16th Sect. of Chung Yung. Moral:—"*They* (the *kwei* and *shin*) cause all the men in the Empire with evenly adjusted [minds] and pure clean [hearts], and arrayed in suitable apparel, to offer to them sacrifices." Confucius, Chung Yung, Sect. 16. The "all men," who are the subjects of this moral influence, and whose minds are here said to be influenced by this *kwei* and *shin* to bring their sacrifices, are explained to mean "all men, from the son of Heaven to the common people."

The intellectual phenomena of the human mind are ascribed to *k'i*, the primordial substance, and not to *li* 理, the other eternally-existing first principle. *E. g.* "所謂精神魂魄有知有覺者皆氣之所爲也 that which we call the discerning faculty and the power of consciousness of the animal spirits and of the human mind, are both derived from *(k'i)* the compound primordial substance."

What account do the men who teach this scheme of cosmogony give of the *hwan* 魂 or human soul? Chú fi'tsz' says, "*hwan ché, k'i chi shin* 魂者氣之神 the human soul is the *shin* of the primordial substance." We have seen above that men, birds, beasts, &c., have the same *shin* with heaven and earth, the *yin* and *yáng*, &c., &c., and that the only difference among them is in form; and that the *kwei* and *shin* of the human body are the same as the *kwei* and *shin* who preside over the mechanism of nature. In their letter of the 30th of January, Dr. Medhurst and his friends urge it as their second objection to *shin* that, "It is applicable as well to the spirit of man, and the *living principle in irrational animals and plants* as it is to the highest being of whom the Chinese have any conception." According to the view of the Chinese pantheists, every pulse that throbs through universal nature is owing to the influence or energy of the *shin;* and this *shin* being inherent in every particle of matter, is expressly declared to be omnipresent, 無往不在. To contend whether this eternally-existing, universal agent, that lies at the foundation of all life, vegetable and animal, and that set the primordial mass in motion, is to be called Spirit or Divinity, would be a mere logomachy, if we could not show that *shin* is used by the Chinese

polytheists as the name of their gods. By the phrase "a spirit," as I have said above, we understand a created, immaterial intelligent being. The human soul is such a spirit; but the *shin* of Chinese cosmogony is no such being as this: it exists before things, and it is an inherent part of the eternally-existing primordial substance, of which heaven and earth, men and all things, are made, and which therefore all things share by their very constitution. To show therefore that the Chinese call the human mind *shin*, as well as *hwan*, by no means proves this word means merely *spirit*, and never god or divinity. How the Chinese came to give the names *kwei* and *shin* to these innate vital energies of the primordial substance, we have no account; but we may suppose that they regarded the words *hwan* soul, and *peh* anima, as not sufficiently dignified to serve as the names of this universal soul and anima, and so they borrowed the names of the objects of worship of their polytheistic countrymen, and called them *kwei* and *shin*.*

This opinion is confirmed by the fact that pantheists have always strongly objected to being classed with atheists, and that to prevent this, they have everywhere used the appellative name of the objects of worship of their theistic countrymen, as the name of the spirit, soul, divinity, or whatever you may choose to call it, which pervades their τὸ πᾶν. The Greek pantheists all did this: all the German and French idealistic pantheists of the present day do the same, and Spinoza calls his universal substance God. It is only on this principle, I think, that we can account for the assertion quoted above, that the *kwei* and *shin* of the human body are the very same as the *kwei* and *shin* who are worshiped; and that these again are the same as the *kwei* and *shin* who preside over the mechanism of nature; *i. e.* the *kwei* and *shin* of the pantheistic cosmogonists.

If we compare the views of Deity held by these Chinese cosmogonists with the views of the Greek philosophers, we shall find them very similar to those of the predecessors of Anaxagoras, who believed that the world was ἔμψυχον, en-souled, or animated with a living soul; and who all "confounded the Infinite Mind or Deity with matter, making them one universe."

I will not pursue this subject any farther, but will only say, I am fully persuaded, that all the instances that have been quoted, in which the word *shin* is used for the human mind, or in a sense analogous to

* I am strongly under the impression that I saw this very reason assigned for calling the universal *hwan* and *peh*, *shin* and *kwei*, in *Chú Hí's Yü Lui* or his *Hwoh-hwan;* but I made no note of it at the time, and can not now lay my hand on the passage.

our word *spirit*, have grown up out of this pantheism of the *yin* and *yáng*; and I can not think, when all the circumstances of the case are considered, that the use of *shin* by these writers as the name of the universal informing spirit or divinity wherever found—in heaven, earth, man, birds or beasts,—is a good argument against the use of this word to render *Elohim* and Θεος. It is a circumstance which rather serves to show that *shin* is the name of the *subject* on which we wish to set the Chinese right; for all these uses of the word that have grown out of pantheism, are, to my mind, only so many evidences of the groping of the human mind in China after the truth on the great subject of Divinity. The polytheistic uses of the word afford evidences of the same thing; and the fact that both pantheists and polytheists have called the name of their highest agent or agents *shin*, is, I contend, the highest kind of evidence that *shin* is, in the Chinese language, the general name of the *subject* on which we want to enlighten the Chinese, and is therefore the very word we are in quest of.

Having now considered the principal arguments which have been adduced by the several parties who have discussed this question, still though very inadequately, at a length, which I fear has been tedious to the Reader, I shall conclude by testing the fitness of each of the three terms that have been proposed, to effect the great object we have in view, which is to remove from the minds of the Chinese all the errors and superstitions on the *subject* of Deity into which *they have fallen*, and to build them up in the knowledge and love of the true God. It is very important for us to remember that the *subject* is not a new one to the Chinese, it has been before their minds and occupied their thoughts for generations; the thousands of temples that have been erected to their objects of worship are monuments of the errors into which they have fallen, and it is upon the ruins of these that the temple of Christian truth must be built.

The first proposition we shall bring to this test is that of rendering the word Θεος, by the Hebrew word *Eloah*, transferred by the three Chinese characters *A-lo-ho* 阿羅訶.

This proposition first claims our attention, as embodying the deliberate conclusion to which three of the Committee of Delegates have been led after a three years' careful examination of this controverted subject. It challenges our attention, too, from the circumstances under which they adopted this foreign term. According to their published letter it was after full consultation with "the most intelligent Chinese to whom they had access" that this step was taken. The parties had had a long experience of Shángtí, that of many, many

years, and both *Tien-tí* and *tí* had been tried for many months; and that too at a time when all the powers of their minds were given to the consideration of this subject. These circumstances invest the opinion of such men (one of them the oldest Protestant missionary in China), given at such a period of the controversy, with great weight. The terms in which they speak of this transferred word, and the arguments with which they urge its adoption on their fellow-missionaries laboring at the Five Ports, show that all doubts, with respect to the course to be pursued, have been removed from their minds, and that they have attained a situation, which they think warrants them to resort to both intimidation and encouragement in addressing their brethren. Their proposed term is one, "against which no *believer* in Divine Revelation *dare raise his voice.*" *!!!* Speaking of their plan of transferring the Hebrew word, they say, "We *can not* go wrong in so doing. It is *sanctioned by the Scriptures:* we are therefore *right* in employing it, *unmistakably* and *incontrovertibly* right. We free ourselves hereby from all mixture with *Chinese superstition.*"

The missionaries who "have but recently come to the country" are dissuaded from forming an opinion of their own upon the subject, until "*a thorough knowledge of the Chinese classics*, and extensive intercourse with the people," put them in a fit position to do so; *ad interim*, these three Delegates, together with the three friends who join them in their Letter of 30th January, offer the persuasive influence of their own example. "Those who have enjoyed (say they) the most of *these advantages* (*i. e.* who have the *most thorough knowledge* of the Classics, and who have had the most extensive intercourse with the Chinese) are *the first* to abandon native terms."

I do not think these expressions at all in good taste from any of the parties who signed this letter, and most especially not from those who had but recently come to China, and I have not quoted them for the purpose of exciting the reader's admiration, but to show how determinately the minds of the signers of this Letter are made up to adhere to the course they have adopted. Being "*unmistakably right*" they are resolved to adhere to Aloho through evil report and good report, and stand pledged to this term, as firmly as solemn convictions published in strong unhesitating language, can pledge men to any course.

It is however, I believe, now well ascertained that notwithstanding this proposition came before them so highly recommended, and that too in such confident language, there has been no single missionary in China induced to follow the lead of the six signers of this Letter.

The transfer of a word having been suggested both in London and New York, the unanimity with which all the missionaries in China, the six abovementioned excepted, have joined in protesting against this course, will no doubt excite much surprise in Europe and America. The missionaries who propose this transfer are clever men; they have made abundant trial, as I said before, of *Shángti*, *T'ien-ti* and *ti*; why then do all the missionaries refuse to follow them? These missionaries are *practical* men, who are guided by sound common sense in conducting their work, and these six signers, disgusted with "the Chinese superstition" mixed up with the native terms they had been using, forgot to take counsel of a friend so plain and unpretending, when they sat down to write their Letter.

The case seems to be a plain one to those who are familiar with the *facts* as we *see* them here in China, and who are willing to be guided by common sense. Demetrius complained of St. Paul, "That not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, he had persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no Θεοι, which are made with hands," &c. Can we suppose that such an effect would have followed from the Apostle's preaching, if St. Paul had contented himself with telling the Ephesians that the Alohos made with hands were false Alohos?

If in preaching against the false gods worshiped by the Ephesians, St. Paul had used the word *Aloho* instead of Θεοι, and Demetrius and his friends had seen the people standing aloof from their Θεοι on this account, they would, as a matter of course, have denied that the Θεοι they made were Alohos, or that the Apostle was preaching against them; if St. Paul in answer to this denial asserted that *they were* Alohos, then it would have been surely pertinent to ask, Why in speaking to Greeks, he did not call them by their Greek name Θεοι?

Now here in China it is notorious that there are a multitude of beings who are worshiped by the whole nation from the Emperor down to the meanest peasant. To these beings they have built thousands of temples, and like the Greeks have made images of them that are met with at every corner of their streets. No one will deny that in the Chinese language there is a name common to all these objects. We ask then, Why, in the name of common sense, should the Christian teacher, when preaching in Chinese against these objects, lay aside their common Chinese name, and call them Alohos? Will this word effect more in his mouth in China, than Aloho would have done from the lips of St. Paul at Ephesus?

(To be concluded in next number.)

Art. II. *Journal of Occurrences: defeat and dispersion of the insurgents, and memorial respecting them; sailing directions for entering the port of Shánghái; visit of H. M. Str. Reynard to Lewchew; death of Rev. C. Fast near Fuhchau fú; the death of Lin Tsehsü.*

The *insurgents*, which have caused so much remark, and not a little fear among the citizens of Canton during the past half year, are now reported as having been completely dispersed, and the leaders fled, leaving their deluded abettors to shift for themselves. If we could get credible accounts of the proceedings of these insurgents, it is probable that we should have most harrowing details of their cruelties and exactions upon the people, and learn to our surprise how savage and merciless such raids and risings are among the Chinese.

Governor Yeh left the provincial capital early last month, with a body of troops, amounting in all to over two thousand. He was afraid to approach the enemy too near, but sent out detachments, one of which was inveigled into some mountain defiles and defeated, as mentioned on page 568. It was in reference to this untoward event, and to the general conduct of the war, that the high provincial authorities forwarded the following memorial to Court, for the translation of which we are indebted to the China Mail.

Memorial of Sū, Governor-general of the Two Kwáng, and of Yeh, Governor of Kwangtung, detailing the capture of certain of the roving banditti:

After the slaughter of two hundred and thirty-two during their flight through the district of Tsing-yuen, the rest had passed into the minor district of Fah-kàng, where thirty had been taken alive; subsequently to this, as an action with them was commencing, the regulars were thrown into disorder by the precipitate flight of the country people (volunteers), who not being disciplined had broken into their ranks; the banditti opposed to them had availed themselves of this, and, in the melée, several officers civil and military were surrounded; these having now rejoined the force in the field are denounced by the memorialists, who had deprived them all, for the time being of their insignia of rank, as in duty bound; reinforcements of regulars and militia were still being moved up by separate routes, to check the further advance of the banditti, and to exterminate them;—upon their respectful representation of all which particulars, looking upward, they implore the sacred glance.

Upon the 24th of the 7th moon (31st August), your servants had the honor to report that upwards of three hundred banditti had been taken by the authorities of the different districts and cantonments in which they had been giving trouble; and that on hearing of their offering resistance to the law in the neighborhood of the Lokia cantonment in Yingteh hien, an express had been sent to the ti-tuh, and the Judge had been directed to move forward a force of regulars and militia to cooperate with him.

The Judge Ki Suh-tsáu has since reported, that the banditti, after no very long stay at Lo-kia, had gone on to the southward, and made directly for the market-town of Kwan-tsien in the Tsingyuen district. The acting district magistrate, Ma Ying-kiái, had issued a proclamation to the country people to excite them to zeal in the good cause; and these, combined with the regulars and militia, on the 27th, 28th, and 29th of the 7th moon (3d, 4th, 5th September), killed at Kwán-ts'ien, thirty-two, amongst whom were two chiefs, Hwang Kwan-lien-shih, and Liu Pih-lien; at Shàng-yoh village, twenty-three, including the chief Lú Ta-tsih-pei (Broadback); at the town of Sz'-kiu, forty-one, including the two chiefs Lú'i Aling and Hwang Hioh-tsiun; on the hills of Hoh-tien, thirty-eight, including the two chiefs Ho Atu and Hwa Mei-sán; at the town of Kwan-chwàng, thirty-nine; at Ki-shán, and Yang-t'áng, fifty-nine, amongst whom were the two chiefs Lui Fi-tsz' (the Fat) and Chú Hung-yuen:—making a total of two hundred and thirty-two killed, and amongst them nine chiefs. The banditti having fled as far as the town of Shih-kioh in Fah-kàng, Hia Ching-yuh, the acting magistrate of that district, together with Li Ming-yung, the jailer, led on some regulars and militia, who killed a large number that showed fight, and took thirty prisoners. The banditti dismayed at this, broke into different bodies, and fled and hid themselves in various places, some higher up, some lower down, the Luh-hu hills, on the confines of Yingteh and Fah-kang.

About this time the expectant prefect, Shi-poh had brought up three hundred militia, and Sū Sung-ah, commanding the advanced brigade of the force under the Tituh, three hundred regulars; and these joiuing two hundred regulars of the San-kiàng brigade, which were already in the field, stationed themlrelves within the walls of the town of Fah-kang district. Information here reached them that the party of banditti which had been lying in Sin-chè for some ten days, were preparing once more to issue from their lurking-place and recommence their disturbances; upon which the Judge in concurrence with the tituh, detached the tsàn-tsiàng, Tsi Ching-ngih, acting adjutant-general to the tituh, and K'àng Ki-siu, ex-commandant of the Tsingyuen brigade, with five hundred regulars, to make a circuit and take the enemy in rear. As they were making these arrangements on the 12th of the 8th moon (17th September), a thousand or more of the country people of the vicinity of Hwang-tien in Fah-kang, volunteered to form their advanced guard, and aid in the attack. The civil and military authorities and their subordinates accordingly put themselves at their head, and led them on with the troops to give battle to the banditti; but just as they reached the neighborhood of the town of Shui-t'au, the latter opened a fire of musketry and artillery, which so alarmed the villagers that they fell back in great confusion, and from their want of discipline broke into, and disordered the ranks of the regulars: these and the militia had killed some ten of the banditti with their fire, but the paths in which they were moving were so narrow, that they could not extend their front with sufficient rapidity; the subaltern Wu Kia-yu was killed on the spot, dying in the ranks, and Hiung Ying-yung, another subordinate to him, was severely wounded. Shi-poh and the rest did all in their power to bring their troops up to fight; but the banditti swarmed on in numbers so great, that the expectant prefect, Shi-poh, the police inspector Ku Hán, and the subalterns Tsiang Chàu-mang, Hang Ta-tsiuen, Hwang Shun-tsiuen, the sergeants Yáu Lien-fah, Wàng Ting-siang, Hwang Hiung-tai, and the sergeant-elect Sin Mau-fang, were all surrounded. Some few of the troops and militia at the same time fell upon the field and some were wounded. Shi-poh loudly reviled the banditti, and plunging into a deep torrent, was severely injured in the head, face, hands, and feet. The banditti were awe-struck and did not venture to kill him, and on the 15th (20th September) he and [the officers who had fallen into their hands] all returned into camp.—At the time they (the Judge, &c.) were writing, the different parties of banditti were dispersing one moment and uniting the next; they had not however any particular station, but were appearing and disappearing on the confines of contiguous districts, roaming here and there and hiding in the numerous defiles of the ten thousand hills of the country. It would therefore be necessary so to reinforce the troops and militia that they might be ready to take steps, as opportunities should occur, to check the advance of the different bands and exterminate them.

Such was their report; and seeing that these gangs, which had moved flankwise across the western border of the province, would now have difficulty in returning by the way they came, from the increased strictness with which all the passes by land or water were guarded; and that they were hemmed in on every side, and all driven into the depths of the hills; it appeared to your Majesty's servants, that, unless the troops and militia were well reinforced, the banditti might work their way into impracticable positions, where their destruction would be still harder to achieve; and it therefore became their duty to intercept their supplies, and by cutting off their communications, so that they could not force people to act under them, to keep them in a state of blockade, until the troops could penetrate [into their fastnesses] and attack them. Your servants have accordingly detached from the city three hundred of the Governor-general's division, four hundred of the Governor's, and one hundred of the brigade of the prefecture of Kwangchau, while the Tituh Siang-lin, has sent on four hundred more of the brigade of the department of Hwui-chau, and one hundred of that of the cantonment of Yung-ngàn (a district therein); and being still apprehensive lest the above force should not be adequate to the occupation of all the approaches, your servants have called out two thousand tried and able-bodied men to serve as militia. The above forces will proceed (or are proceeding), one body after another, [to a point where] they will receive their orders from the Tituh, who, in concert with the Judge, will adopt, according to the nature of the ground, measures for the defense of the country, or advance to destroy. They are on no account to adhere to any preconceived notions which might induce them to shun danger or to be oversparing of expense; nor are they to be misled by idle rumors, nor are they to color, be it ever so little, the facts which they may witness, and so leave uneradicated the root of future evil. If such of the civil and military officers, and of the troops and militia employed, as are zealous and exert themselves, be immediately recommended for promotion, to encourage others; and those who show themselves afraid of risk suspended, denounced, and punished; rewards being distributed with good faith, and punishments inflicted with certainty,—this matter will soon be brought to a conclusion.

With reference to the expectant prefect Shi-poh, his determination to sacrifice himself, not yielding though surrounded, is an extenuating circumstance; still he sustained a defeat by his want of caution in advancing, and it would not be expedient that his rash

mismanagement should be punished one whit the less severely on account of his high reputation earned by the many meritorious acts of his past life; it is our duty, notwithstanding these, therefore, to denounce him in severe terms, and to request that his insignia of rank be taken from him for the time being.

The petty magistrate Ku Hán, the subalterns Tsiang Cháu-kang, Hwang Ta-tsiuen, and Hwang Shun-tsiuen, sergeants Yáu Ting-fáh, Wang Ting-siang, and Hwang Hiung-tai, and the sergeant-elect Sin Yung-fáng, who were surrounded at the same time as Shi-poh, have all been temporarily deprived of their insignia, but it is not expedient that they should be allowed to withdraw themselves from this troublesome business, and they are therefore charged to continue at their posts and endeavor to redeem their character; and as they shall be found to show a sense of shame and exert themselves or the reverse, a report will be presented, when the whole affair shall have been settled, for your Majesty's further decision concerning them: but as regards the tsán-tsiáng Tsi-ching-eh, the acting adjutant-general to the Tituh, and the ex-commandant of the Tsing-yuen brigade, Kiang Ki-siu, who were detached with troops by circuitous routes to attack the enemy on both flanks, it is not yet apparent whether the engagement of one of these corps with the enemy, before they had joined company, took place in consequence of an unacquaintance with the roads through which they had to march, or whether there was an intentional delay [on the part of the rearmost corps]; the truth will be, with permission, shortly ascertained, and each of the parties disposed of according to his merits.

The above are the particulars of the movements of the troops and of the defeat sustained by the civilians and military denounced; this joint statement of the same embodied in a respectful memorial, your Majesty's servants dispatch by an express courier. Prostrate they implore your Majesty's sacred glance thereon, and instructions as to whether their conduct has or has not been that which it should. A respectful memorial.

The wary and cowardly fúyuen contented himself with guarding all his defenses, and running no more hazards of defeat, until the outrages and levies of the insurgents had so exasperated the inhabitants of the districts into which they had come that the gentry gathered their braves, and on the 24th of this month attacked the "thieves" in conjunction with the imperialists. A slip issued in Canton soon after, thus noticed the result:—"Letters have come to the provincial capital from Yingteh and Tsingyuen, saying, that from the 24th to the 30th of Nov. the government troops had daily entered the hills, seizing and pursuing the insurgents to the Black Stone country. For two or three days they fought together with thundering clamor. The insurgents were defeated, more than a thousand taken prisoners, 13 large guns and over 500 small arms captured, with spears, swords, and other warlike implements without number." The accounts of their defeat, of the people running together to pursue them, and the rancor exhibited in destroying them, according to the most credible accounts, are proofs of the hatred they have aroused. Of course, Gov. Yeh took the whole glory of the victory to himself, though he is notorious among the citizens of Canton for his cowardice, and has throughout shown the most dastardly fear.

The following directions for entering the port of Shánghái are taken from No. 3 of the North China Herald. They will form a good addition to the surveys given in Vol. X. page 383 by Capt. Bethune of the "Conway," and in Vol. XII, page 427 by Capt. Wellesley of the "Childers," both which they explain, and render more satisfactory. They are given in a communication addressed to the editor:—

The directions given by the surveying officers are, I think, too vague to be of much use in practice to strangers; particularly, in giving courses and distances to be made good, when there are no marks available, and the strength and direction of the tide are constantly varying. The Admiralty Chart of 1843, drawn from Collinson's survey, is very correct; and every vessel bound to Shanghai should be provided with it. The following remarks, I think may prove of service, as the result of several years' acquaintance with the place, in all weathers.

Vessels bound to Shanghai should make the Barren Islands or Saddle Group in the northerly monsoon, as being the most weatherly land fall; but in the southwest monsoon, it is more advisable to steer for Monte Video, a bold precipitous island, about forty miles more southward. If late in the day, anchorage should be caught under the Saddle Islands, which afford shelter in both monsoons.

Leaving the Saddle Islands, keep the North Saddle bearing about S E. by E. to pass Gutzlaff I., at a distance of about fifteen or sixteen miles; and no stranger ought to enter the river without seeing Gutzlaff, until some mark be erected for the North Sandhead. Thus far, the tide sets N.W. by W. and S.E. by E., from one and-a-half to three and-a-half knots; but it is affected greatly, both in direction and velocity, by the prevailing wind.

Steering on to the north-westward, bring Gutzlaff to bear S.S.E., and sink it on that bearing, which will be at a distance of about twenty-two or twenty-three miles; after which steer N.W. ½ W., and if the low land is not soon seen on the port bow from the mast head, keep more westerly by the lead, which is here a safe guide. The deepest water is near the north bank, which should always be approached with caution, as it shoals very suddenly. When the first point bears W. by N. or W., the water deepens to six fathoms; this point should be passed about two miles off, as the bank extends a long way out, and there are several knolls off it, on which ships have touched. Having passed the point, gradually close with the shore to a mile, and keep it about that distance, until the beacon at Wúsung is seen. If working up from the Saddle Islands, do not bring Gutzlaff to the eastward of south, until fifteen or sixteen miles to the northward of it, when it may be brought to bear S.S.E., and you will then be on the edge of the South bank. You may now stand to the westward, nearly into the vessel's draught, bearing in mind that the flood sets W.S.W. round the S.E. edge of it, and the ebb contrary. All vessels should keep as near as possible to this bank, and not wait for a shoal cast to tack when standing to the north-eastward.

I think the defect in the directions hitherto given, is chiefly, that vessels are not advised to get hold of the South bank as soon as possible.

From the Saddle Islands to Wúsung, the tide generally sets N.W. by W. and S.E. by E. when fully made, if no cause, such as N.E. gales or heavy rains interfere; but the flood makes *first* to the southward, then S.W., and N.W. at the entrance of the river; the ebb making North, passing by N.E. to S E, and it is at turn of tide that most caution is necessary, to avoid being set out of the channel. I have found the set of the ship pretty correctly by the deep sea lead, and have, on several occasions, gone up the river at night by its guidance. Having passed the first point, which the "Conway's" surveyors mention to be distinguishable by a large tree (although I could never make out any tree there sufficiently remarkable),—work up from three-quarters of a mile to two miles off shore, and do not wait for a second shoal cast on the North side. The narrowest part of the channel is where the house on Blockhouse Island bears N.E. by E. It is here about a mile and-a-quarter wide.

When the ships at Wúsung are open, a peaked tower near the town of Paushan will be seen to the westward; and on the embankment in front of it, a beacon, which must be kept a little open to the southward of the tower, until another large beacon at the entrance of the Shanghai river is on, between two joss-poles behind it, painted red, and bearing W.S.W. This last is an excellent mark for the channel, which is very contracted. The beacon may be brought a little open on each side of the poles, and the water shoals gradually on each side; but the tide does not set exactly fair through.

Chinese pilots are in attendance here in sanpans, although with a fair wind they are not required, as Collinson's Chart of the Shanghai river is very good.

The foregoing remarks apply to vessels of a heavy draught; say eighteen feet. Small craft may use much more freedom, closing with the South bank when Gutzlaff is twelve or fifteen miles off to the southward, and working up with the lead for a guide, never coming over half three fathoms to the north-eastward. The southern shore is to be depended on all the way; but when within ten miles of Wúsung, the bank is very steep, and should not be approached under three-quarters of a mile.

I offer the following suggestions for rendering the navigation of the Yang-tsz' kiang comparatively safe and simple, which may be effected at a trifling cost, considering the valuable trade of Shanghai.

There is, off the southern end of the North Sand, a spit or patch, having four and five fathoms close to on each side, which is the principal danger on enter-

ing the river; and every vessel wrecked hitherto, with one exception, has been on this spit. I would therefore recommend that a *Light* vessel should be placed in the hight, between this spit and the main bank, where, with good heavy ground tackle, she would ride out any weather. A vessel of one hundred and twenty tons strongly built, on the principle of the *Light* vessels at the Sandheads of the Hoogly, would be large enough. She should be fitted with a light, to be distinguishable from a ship's light or those that the fishermen often show; and visible at least seven miles distant. She should be supplied with two good coir cables, as well as with chains, in order to enable her to ride to the high sea that sometimes occurs; and she should also be provided with a life boat, and a European should continually be on board, sufficiently acquainted with the river, and with the indications of the weather, to warn vessels by signal or otherwise, of approaching danger.

In addition to the light, I would place a buoy off the N.W. end of the spit, and another off the South end, which, I think, are all that would be necessary in any ordinary weather: but in standing in from sea, I am decidedly of opinion that a stranger should not attempt to run in, unless certain of getting within the bar, if there are indications of bad weather; but rather, he should seek anchorage among the islands, or else put to sea for the night; the former would be preferable in heavy weather, for unless a good sailer, a vessel would not fetch up again in the N. E. monsoon. The tides are so strong, and at times so uncertain in direction, that the best acquainted persons can not hope to keep a correct reckoning at night; and it would prove very rough riding, should a ship attempt to anchor between Gutzlaff I. and the North Sands in a gale.

I think it quite useless attempting to erect a beacon on the Sand, with the means that would be available here; as the tide runs with great velocity, and I am not aware that any part of the patch has less than nine feet water on it. The flood often comes in with a heavy bore or roller, when a southerly wind is blowing; and I do not think that a sufficient foundation could be formed to justify the expectation of a beacon standing the combined action of the wind and tide.

No doubt a beacon might be placed on the North Sand itself, where it dries, in many ways; for instance, by sinking a foundation in iron tanks; but it would be at a greater distance from the channel;—it would cost more to keep a light on it, and altogether it would be less useful than a floating light.

A Young Salt.

A visit to Lewchew was made Oct. 3d, in H. B. M. screw sloop Reynard, Capt. Cracroft, by the Bishop of Victoria, in order to ascertain the position and prospects of Dr. Bettelheim, and for the captain to intimate to the authorities of the island that the British Government regarded him as a British subject, "and would be displeased at any attempt to expel him from the island by a system of persecution or annoyance." Several interviews were held between the native officials and Capt. Cracroft, and each party gave an entertainment. The Reynard is the first steamer which has visited countries under Japanese rule, and an account of her and her visit has probably ere this reached Yedo. It is to be hoped that the personal situation of Dr Bettelheim will be improved by this movement on the part of the British authorities, and his family allowed to supply themselves with the necessaries of life. It is remarked by the China Mail as a singular circumstance that the Japanese authorities at Lewchew have coöperated with the Chinese government in reference to Dr. B., so as to induce Gov. Sü, the imperial commissioner, to urge H. M.'s Plenipotentiary to remove him (Dr. B.) from Napa by force.

The death of the Rev. C. Fast, a missionary of the Swedish Missionary Society at Upsal is mentioned in letters received from Fuhchau, and the circumstances attending it detailed. We understand that the authorities at Fuhchau have taken energetic measures to apprehend the miscreants, and have sent the police to the village near Kinpai pass to arrest the guilty parties. By means of the servant mentioned in the notice below, who identified

some of the piratical crew, they convicted the guilty parties and beheaded five of them, and burned the houses of those implicated. The villagers are reported to have for the most part fled from the place after the visit of the police. The acting British consul, Mr. Sinclair, reported the event to the authorities, but it appears they had already taken their measures. We think that it was unwise for these two gentlemen to use fire-arms as they did, and it is not so certain that the dacoits had the intention to take life, as this notice intimates. The notice of the attack on Messrs. Fast and Elgquist is thus given by our correspondent:—

"On the evening of the 12th of this month, Rev. Messrs. Fast and Elgquist, in a small boat with three rowers, went down the river to the receiving ships for the purpose of exchanging their bills. The latter took with him a servant boy, of perhaps fifteen or sixteen years. After visiting one of the vessels the next morning, and passing to the second, their boatmen inquired, "Have you got your money yet?" This was deemed a strange question, but replied to in the negative. On leaving the second vessel on the morning of the 13th, the inquiry was repeated and answered in the affirmative. During the stay of the brethren at the vessels, the boatmen went ashore, and when they were questioned as to the reason, replied that they went to buy some small articles they needed. The gentlemen however proceeded in the boat to return home. On nearing the Kinpai pass, not more than two or three miles from the vessels, about eleven o'clock in the forenoon, the boatmen were observed to be inactive, and were urged in vain to row faster. Soon after a sail boat came in sight a short distance ahead, apparently bound up the river. The wind being light, the row-boat soon came up with the sail boat (it seems right alongside), when those on the latter instantly hooked on and commenced a fierce assault with stones and spears. Messrs. E. and F. both seemed to feel that the pirates intended to put them to death, and that they themselves must fight for life. Mr. F. put his head out from under cover and fired a pistol. Mr. E. rushed out to resist the attack, and fired twice upon the pirates. He soon called on Mr. F. to fire a pistol lying by his side, but the latter replied that he was unable. Soon after he either fell or was thrown overboard; unable to swim, he sank and was seen no more. Mr. E. finding resistanee useless, dropped overboard, dove deep, and swam some distance down; then swam ashore. For a time he waited, hoping to see something of Mr Fast; then wounded and weary, wandered about to find the vessels he had left His fear of being discovered by those on shore, protracted his wanderings, and it was not till near evening he reached the shore opposite, and was received on board.

"In the meantime, the pirates, numbering it is said some 30 or 40, took the boat, boatmen, and booty to a village just below the Pass on the south side. They threatened the life of the servant boy on account of a severe injury one of their number had received, but finally released him and the boatmen. On their return all were taken into the custody of the government either on suspicion of being accessory to the piracy, or to furnish evidence in the case.

"Mr Fast's body has not been seen since. The wounds received by Mr. Elgquist have not proved serious. Mr Fast had greatly endeared himself to his fellow-laborers by his kind and social disposition, and by the simplicity and fervor of his Christian character. Eminently exhibiting Christian love out of a warm and sincere heart, he has left a precious memory behind in the hearts of his associates."

The death of Lin Tsehsü, whose appointment was noticed last month, died on his way to Canton on the 22d inst. at Páuning hien in the department of Chánchau in the eastern part of this province. He was 67 years old at the time of his death, and had taken a conspicuous part in the foreign politics of his country during the last ten years of his life. In the death of Lin, his majesty Hienfung has lost one of his most faithful servants.